2013

An Analysis of a Suburban School District's Referral, Assessment, and Identification Processes for Gifted Evaluations

Brandie Tallman Arnold
Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, blt2820@verizon.net

Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine

Department of Psychology

AN ANALYSIS OF A SUBURBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT'S REFERRAL, ASSESSMENT, AND IDENTIFICATION PROCESSES FOR GIFTED EVALUATIONS

By Brandie Tallman Arnold

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Psychology

April 2013

PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dissertation Approval

This is to certify that the thesis presented to us by **Brandie Tallman Arnold** on the **29th** day of **May 2012** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Psychology, has been examined and is accepted in both scholarship and literary quality.

Committee Members' Signatures:

George McCloskey, Ph.D., Chairperson

Terri Erbacher, Ph.D.

Lori Lennon, Psy.D.

Robert A. DiTomasso, Ph.D., ABPP, Chair, Department of Psychology

Acknowledgments

To my husband Jason Arnold, thank you for your ongoing support, encouragement and patience, especially over the last six years. This endeavor was a challenging journey for both of us, filled with triumphs and tribulations too numerous to count. Thank you for taking care of the girls and the house during the long hours I spent studying, writing, and working. I am and will be forever grateful to you for helping me to realize my dreams.

To my mother Bonnie Tallman, thank you for being such a wonderful mother and for always believing in me and encouraging me to reach for the stars. Thank you, Mom, for the many sacrifices that you made that allowed me to further my education. To my late father Barry Tallman, I hope I've made you proud. I figure you are "here" on many a day and night along the journey and for that, I thank you. To my late grandmother Anne Umstad Perosa, I thank you for the love and pride you had for me since the day I was born. And to my late grandfather Richard A. Perosa, I am indebted to you for piquing my interest in all things genius.

To my chairperson, Dr. George McCloskey, who is the most brilliant individual I know. It has been a genuine honor to work so closely with you and to witness your own giftedness as you guided me through this process. It is difficult to find adequate words to express my admiration and gratitude for your meticulous, thorough, and thoughtful supervision. Thank you very much from the bottom of my heart for seeing my potential, for believing in me, and for gently but firmly demanding no less than the best from me. I will never forget these gifts.

To Dr. Lori Lennon, thank you for your kind and wise advice, and for your endless supply of encouragement. It has been a privilege to work with you and I want you to know I am very proud to be your colleague. To Dr. Ray Christner, for your generous help with the earlier phases of this process, and to Dr. Terri Erbacher for agreeing to step in for Dr. Christner as I approached the finish line. To Dr. Rosemary Mennuti who is a most special and wonderful woman, and who will always be a great mentor to me. Thank you for believing in me, Roe, and for the professional opportunities you have entrusted to me. To the rest of my professors at PCOM, thank you for a memorable ride. I learned a great deal from each of you. Truly, it has been humbling to receive guidance from such outstanding professionals.

To my sisters, family, friends, and fellow PCOM students, I thank you for sharing in my happiness and for being there for me. Also, I wish to give a special thanks to my Aunt Myrtle "Banie" Cavaliere for being my "Chapter 4 Cheerleader," to my brother-in-law, Scott Garner, for his ongoing interest and support in my doctoral work, to the late Eileen Capion, for her clerical support with data collection and also for her friendship, to Dr. Nixa Rodriguez for insisting that I never give up, and to Dr. Bridgette Vecchio, who talked me into this wild idea in the first place and who was a great support to me along the way.

And last but certainly not least, to my beautiful daughters, Kenzie and Maris, and to my lovely stepdaughter, Jordan. I am so grateful for your love and encouragement. There were so many days and nights that I missed you terribly while I was away at school working toward my academic pursuits. It was always you who motivated me to keep going as I strived to set a strong example for you about determination and perseverance.

I am so very proud of each one of you, and I do hope that you will always carry with you the importance of education. I want you to always remember how much I love you, and that you can accomplish whatever you set out to do when you believe in yourself and never give up. I dedicate this work to my girls. I love you to the moon and back! Always reach high; that's where the stars are.

Abstract

A review of the literature pertaining to giftedness reveals a myriad of differing conceptualizations, as well as varied recommendations for procedures within the referral and identification processes. With such diverse frameworks for understanding components of giftedness, as well as competing views about how giftedness is most accurately identified, a universally agreed upon process for defining and identifying giftedness has yet to be achieved. The purpose of this proposed study will be to examine the referral, identification, and outcomes process of one Pennsylvania public school district's gifted evaluation process. Specifically, this action-oriented research study sets out to determine (1) the demographic characteristics of students referred for assessment to determine eligibility for gifted program services; (2) what assessment procedures were used to determine eligibility; (3) how the children performed on the assessments; (4) what criteria were used to determine eligibility; (5) what relationships were found among the various assessment components, and (6) what assessment components and/or demographic variables had the greatest influence on eligibility decisions. A thorough analysis of the descriptive data including variables such as those school psychologists performing the evaluation, school building, referral source, gender, ethnicity, other exceptionality, age and grade level of the children could prove to be advantageous to the school district, allowing for recommendations to be offered that will improve the current system.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

The field of gifted education is characterized by many competing recommendations about philosophical rationales for gifted programs, about choosing models for the identification of gifted students, determining programming options, developing curricula, addressing the social and emotional needs of gifted students, and even about choosing a definition of giftedness (Callahan & Moon, 2007). Pfeiffer (2003) asked questions of 64 authorities in the gifted field and reported that 94% of respondents agreed that the concept concerning definitions and conceptualizations of gifted and talented was their number one concern, and the concept concerning problems with the identification process was their second most frequently cited issue (41%).

A review of the literature reveals that differing conceptualizations of giftedness, along with varied procedures within the identification process, have muddied the waters for some time. Clearly, these issues are troubling and not only do they warrant attention in the field, but they also highlight the critical need for the development of a more systematic way of defining and identifying giftedness.

Statement of the Problem

Uncertain definitions of giftedness and the varied procedures for identifying gifted and talented students have long plagued the field and have created a conundrum for teachers, administrators, and other educators (Bracken & Brown, 2006). Although the experts are unwavering in their position that people in the field ought not to rely solely on intelligence test scores to identify children for gifted and talented programs, they have not

achieved consensus on a definition of giftedness, nor have they established consistent procedures to identify children who are gifted (Renzulli, 2004). Definitional criteria for giftedness, as well as guidelines for identification and admission into gifted programs may vary significantly, even when comparing criteria from schools in the same county or state. Undoubtedly, these recurring issues continue to adversely affect the provision of gifted services in the public schools (Pfeiffer, 2003). Moreover, these issues beg the following question: Can a more systematic and universal way of defining and identifying giftedness be achieved?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive study, which has an action oriented research perspective, is to examine the referral, assessment, and decisions/outcomes process for students who have undergone gifted evaluations over the course of four school years in a suburban school district located near the outskirts of Reading, Pennsylvania. Specifically, there are research interests related to the following information: the demographic characteristics of students referred for assessment to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program; the assessment procedures used to determine their eligibility; the children's performance on the assessments; criteria used to determine their eligibility; the relationships, if any, found between the various assessment components; and finally, those assessment components and/or demographic variables that had the greatest influence on eligibility decisions.

The method of study involved the collection of data relevant to the research questions from school records spanning the last four years. A thorough analysis of the descriptive

data followed, allowing for recommendations to be offered in efforts to improve the current system being used by the district. Ultimately, this study will contribute to a reduction in false negatives during the identification (decisions/outcomes) process and, overall, to additional improvements through a more systematically applied processes when referring, evaluating, and making decisions about students who may require gifted support programming.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Defining giftedness

As demonstrated through a review of the literature, giftedness can be defined in a myriad of ways. Over the last century, there has been considerable change in the ways in which giftedness has been conceptualized (Friedman-Nimz, O'Brien, & Frey, 2005). Traditionally, researchers have equated high general intelligence, as measured by a very superior global IQ score, with giftedness. For many years, the accepted definition for giftedness was an intelligence quotient of 140 and above, first proposed by Terman (1925). However, the Marland (1972) definition, adopted by the U.S. Department of Education and by most state education departments and school districts (Brody & Mills, 1997), recognized the fact that giftedness included a broader conception of other abilities.

The widely accepted federal definition of giftedness underscores the presence of a high IQ, highlighting also other characteristics commonly associated with and seen in mentally gifted individuals. Mentally gifted is defined as "outstanding intellectual and creative ability the development of which requires specially designed programs or support services, or both, not ordinarily provided in the regular education program" (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2005). The definition provides further clarification that the term 'mentally gifted' includes a person who not only has an IQ of 130 or higher but also other factors. Gifted ability cannot be based on IQ score alone; hence, if one's IQ score is lower than 130, the individual may be admitted to a gifted program if he or she exhibits one or more of the following factors: a year or more above grade level achievement for the normal age group in one or more subjects; an observed or

measured rate of acquisition/retention of new academic content or skills that reflect gifted ability; achievement, performance or expertise in one or more academic areas; early and measured use of high level thinking skills, academic creativity, leadership skills, intense academic interest areas, communication skills, foreign language aptitude, or technology expertise, and documented, observed, validated, or assessed evidence that intervening factors such as English as a second language, learning disability, physical impairment, emotional disability, gender or race bias, or socio/cultural deprivation are masking gifted abilities (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2005).

Theoretical conceptualizations of giftedness

As revealed by a review of the literature, researchers and educators often differ in how they define or conceptualize giftedness. Traditionally, giftedness has been defined as high intelligence, as measured by global IQ scores; however, arguments have been advanced for expanding and differentiating the concept. For instance, Sternberg's (1981, 1985, 1991) triarchic theory of intelligence allows for three very different kinds of gifts including those that are analytic, synthetic, and practical. Davidson and Sternberg's (1984) theory defines insight as central to giftedness; gifted children excel at solving insight problems because they are skilled at selectively encoding information (sifting out what is relevant to a problem) and at selectively combining and comparing information. Renzulli's (1978) three-ring theory of gifted behaviors emphasizes high ability, task commitment, and creativity. Getzels and Jackson's theory (1962) cites creativity as a part of giftedness. Finally, derived within a heterogeneous framework, Gardner's (1997) Multiple Intelligences (MI) model is widely known, proposing that high ability or

remarkable development can occur separately in one or more of the following areas: linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, and naturalistic.

The literature demonstrates that the debate continues over whether or not giftedness represents a more or less homogeneous profile of abilities and skills. Morgan (1996), for instance, has criticized the MI model, acknowledging its resemblance to earlier theories, such as Thurstone's (1938) multifactor theory of intelligence. Morgan suggested that the notion of multiple intelligences soothes the educator's psychological discomfort of singling out the intellectually gifted or the creatively talented student (Bain, Choate, & Bliss, 2006). In sum, the research offers an extensive range of theoretical viewpoints pertaining to the concept of giftedness.

Characteristics commonly associated with the gifted

The relevant literature indicates that, historically, the term giftedness was synonymous with "intellectual giftedness," and the pioneering researchers investigated the nature and characteristics of gifted individuals only *after* setting minimal IQ standards for identification. Over time, definitional criteria for giftedness broadened, and the idea has continued to be held that a standard pattern of characteristics exists, although it may not necessarily be consistent across all children who are gifted. Tieso (2007) points out that developmental psychologists and theorists have identified biographical or background traits that distinguish gifted, talented, or creative individuals from others; these include, but are not limited to such characteristics as keen observation, high alertness and attention, emotional sensitivity, intense frustrations, curiosity, active

imagination, risk-taking tendencies, and high energy. Although the following information is not intended to represent an exhaustive list, the more commonly cited characteristics of giftedness are highlighted; these often are used to advise teachers and parents in referring such children for special services or gifted programming (Bain et al., 2006).

Thinking and problem-solving style

Foremost, superior intellect and problem solving skills are associated with the gifted. Higher level thinking skills increase the gifted individual's ability to derive solutions to complex problems with ease and accuracy. Specifically, Rogers (1986) found that gifted children are different from average children in cognitive style. The gifted are more likely to think independently, to take an active approach toward problem solving, to persist at tasks, have less need than do average children for structure and adult scaffolding, and score higher on self-efficacy and internal locus of control measures. Many of these children appear to possess an ability to intuit solutions to challenging problems without help, and often display incredible retention of complex information.

Personality style

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) has been used extensively to assess the psychological types of both gifted and non gifted pools of students (Myers, 1962). The MBTI, based on the work of Carl Jung (1921/1971), attempts to describe an individual's preferred way of interacting with the world. The MBTI purports to assess four dimensions: Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving. Several studies researching the MBTI with gifted adolescents have

generated some consistent findings. For example, several authors (Cordrey, 1986; Delbridge-Parker & Robinson, 1989; Gallagher, 1990; Hawkins, 1997; McCarthy, 1975; McGinn, 1976; Mills, 2003; Mills, Moore, & Parker, 1996; Mills & Parker, 1998) found that in comparison with the normal population, there tends to be a higher orientation toward N and Intuition-Perceiving (NP) among the gifted population. In addition, these studies reported that gifted adolescents' personalities often differ from the personalities of adolescents with average abilities on the S/N dimension. The N personality type in the gifted student reflects a tendency to prefer tasks that involve imagination, insight, and inspiration. They also prefer courses on theory rather than courses that are heavily fact laden. They prefer to learn independently and at their own pace, progress nonlinearly, and discard projects when their enthusiasm wanes. Conversely, non-gifted adolescents tend to be sensors. The preference for S reflects a tendency to be present-oriented, factual, attentive to details, concrete in thinking, and focused on following established procedures.

One commonality in the research on personality type is evidence that contradicts the longstanding assumption that most gifted adolescents are introverted (Cross, Speirs Neumeister, & Cassady, 2007). According to numerous studies, gifted adolescents are split approximately 50/50 on the E/I dimension. This equitable distribution represents a noteworthy departure from the general population that has shown a 72/28 ratio in favor of E (Nichols & Pass, 1993). Cross et al. (2007) replicated this finding in their study that examined differential type orientations for gifted males and females. The data suggested that gifted adolescents may be less polarized on the E/I dichotomy than the normal population, supporting a hypothesis that these individuals may "have the best of both,"

benefiting from their abilities to share ideas and build relationships with others and simultaneously to work independently and focus their energies on their inner world of ideas.

Creativity, task commitment, and curiosity

Winner's (2000) definition of giftedness includes children who are precocious, self-motivated, and who approach problems in their domain of talent in an original or creative way. Renzulli (1978) emphasizes task commitment within his theory of giftedness, as well as creativity, the latter being the same construct that is highlighted in Getzels and Jackson's (1962) conceptualization of giftedness. Winner (1996) underscores the idea that gifted children are, indeed, qualitatively different from average children in their intrinsic drive and commitment to immerse themselves in a domain. Often, gifted children cannot be torn away from work in their area of ability; flow is achieved by setting challenges for themselves (Kanevsky, 1992). Intellectual curiosity, coupled with ability and commitment, allows one the capacity to integrate large amounts of information into one's knowledge base, and interests are marked by a clear goal orientation.

Sadly, preserving their creativity is a real challenge for many gifted children. For instance, children who reveled in imaginary relationships or frolicked with pretend playmates may be confronted by friends at recess who begin to laugh at the 'absurdity' of such notions. As these children who are endowed with vivid imaginations become older, there is often social pressure that leads to a desire to conform and be accepted by their

peers and teachers (Torrance & Safter, 1999). The result is that many of these talented children may leave their originality behind them.

Asynchronous development

Discordant rates of social, emotional, and intellectual development are common among the gifted and require special attention (Liu, Lien, Kafka, & Stein, 2005). One example of asynchronous development is a situation in which a youngster has a remarkable vocabulary and the ability to engage in conversation, but perhaps his or her motor skills may be developing at rates similar to their same-aged peers. Otherwise stated, the child may display gifted characteristics in one area and not in another. A problematic issue arises when a teacher or parent who interacts with the child forms an expectation that the child's functioning in all areas should be equally well developed. Much of the time, however, this kind of expectation is unrealistic and ill-informed. For those who interact with gifted individuals, it is critical to remember that their functioning is likely not balanced across various areas of development.

Overexcitabilities

The research is clear that the depth and affective intensity of gifted individuals frequently sets them apart from others. One of the traits most often associated with gifted children is their heightened sensitivity; the depth and intensity of feeling with which the environment and other people affect them (Lovecky, 1991). Piechowski (1979) and Silverman (1993) suggested that intensity, so often a characteristic of gifted and creative individuals, may be explained in terms of overexcitabilities (OEs; i.e., greater capacities

to respond to various stimuli). Described in a different way, overexcitiabilites are filters through which the outside world reaches the individual (Piechowski, 1979).

The concept of overexcitabilities spawned from Dabrowski's (1964) original concept of developmental potential, was based on his work with gifted individuals under conditions of extreme stress, specifically, the rise of Fascism in Germany and Eastern Europe. Dabrowski (1964) defined developmental potential as a genetic endowment of traits that determine that level of moral development that a person may reach under ideal circumstances. Dabrowski believed that one's developmental potential is contingent upon one's level of intelligence, one's talents, one's will to develop, and one's levels of overexcitabilities (Gross, Rinn, & Jamieson, 2007).

The defining characteristics of developmental potential are five forms of OE or special talents and abilities; that is, 'types of increased psychic excitability' and specific types of nervous energy Dabrowski saw in gifted and creative individuals (Tieso, 2007). It was hypothesized (Piechowski, 1986) that these characteristics of OE may be more prevalent in gifted and creative individuals than in the general population. The term OE was chosen to suggest a special kind of responding, experiencing, and behaving (Piechowski & Colangelo, 1984) and that only when expressions of excitability are beyond and above what can be considered average do they make a significant contribution to developing one's potential and subsequently to the cultivation of giftedness or creativity.

A review of the research finds reference to overexcitabilities in intellectual, emotional, sensual, imaginational, and psychomotor areas. An intellectual overexcitability is associated with striving for knowledge and truth through questioning,

discovering, and analyzing, but differs from the construct of intelligence. This intellectual mode is characterized by a need for continuous and intense intellectual stimulation. An emotional overexcitability is marked by an intensified level of interpersonal relationships and attachments to people, things, and places, and compassionate feelings for others. Its manifestations may include somatic expressions, extreme and complex feelings such as empathy, loneliness, and the happiness and joy of love. A sensual overexcitability is an enhanced level of sensory experience and is marked by the pursuit of pleasure through senses such as taste and smell. The sensual mode relies on sensory contact and a need for sensory stimulation, including sensuality. An imaginational overexcitability is characterized by daydreaming, fantasizing, dramatization, and the strong use of visual images and metaphors. In order to escape boredom, those with an imaginational overexcitability may create an elaborate imaginary world. A psychomotor overexcitability refers to movement, restlessness, action, and an excess of nervousness and energy. Manifestations include extreme enthusiasm, rapid speech, love of intense activity, and impulsive actions (Ackerman, 1997; Bouchet & Falk, 2001; Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977; Piechowski, 1979; Piechowski & Colangelo, 1984).

Winner (1996) refers to the gifted person's passionate intensity as a 'rage to master.' Difficulties that may emerge from intense affective states range from awkward social interactions to depression (Liu et al., 2005). It should be noted that overexcitabilities, or heightened emotionality, if not truly serving a purpose for furthering one's developmental potential, may overwhelm an individual unless he or she is able to find appropriate outlets.

Issue awareness

Another theme in the research characterizes the gifted person's heightened sensitivity and affective intensity to factors that contribute to 'issue awareness.' Hollingworth (1942) observed that typical children become interested in "questions of origin and destiny" around the age of 12-13 years, and argued that early interest in such issues was an indication of giftedness. Many have echoed Hollingworth's claim that at an unusually young age, highly gifted children become aware of philosophical, societal, moral, and metaphysical issues (Carroll, 1940; Derevensky & Coleman, 1989; Freeman, 1994; Hollingworth, 1942; Roeper, 1982; Silverman, 1994; Winner, 1996). Issue awareness (Von Karolyi, 2006) refers to the identification or recognition of a substantive social, cultural, environmental, or physical circumstance; or a philosophical, psychological, existential, or metaphysical construct that has a recognized, unresolved component and that is "extensive," or extends beyond the individual's immediate experience.

Studies that include control groups of typical children reveal that gifted children's wishes, worries, fears, and expectations of the future reflect higher than average levels of issue awareness (Von Karolyi, 2006). For example, in Winstead's (1999) qualitative study of first and second grade girls, no member of the control group indicated a wish or worry related to an extensive issue, nor did their mothers report the girls had such wishes or worries. In contrast, the gifted group's responses included extensive issues such as "world peace, 'no poor people,' 'no endangered species,' and happiness for the world;" and their mothers reported that the gifted children worried about "social problems, future events, environment, food shortages, child abuse, wasted resources, and war."

The research suggests that the worries and concerns of some gifted children can differ greatly from those of the average child. Although some children fret from one day to the next if recess is going to be delayed or canceled, there are, indeed, children who worry about endangered animals or the attainment of world peace. Clearly, the latter concerns may be more likely to lead to emotional distress in one form or another.

Perfectionism

Although the propensity for perfectionism is mentioned repeatedly in the giftedness literature, findings are equivocal because some studies have found no difference in the prevalence of perfectionism in the gifted population (Parker & Mills, 1996; Parker, Portesova, & Stumpf, 2001), whereas the results of other studies suggest that perfectionism may be more prevalent in the gifted population, compared with the general population (Baker, 1996; Parker & Adkins, 1995; Roberts & Lovett, 1994). Plucker and Levy (2001) suggest that perfectionism in gifted persons can be fostered by a pressure to perform consistently at high levels. Reis and Renzulli (2004) agree that the psychological response of perfectionism affects many gifted and talented students, and it generally involves holding very high standards for one's performance, which can produce either very positive or very negative outcomes.

On a positive note, perfectionism can lend itself to perseverance and tenacity, which in turn can lead to major accomplishments and success. On the other hand, unhealthy and unrealistic perfectionistic tendencies can translate into procrastination, eating disorders, excessive self-criticism, avoidance, and failure. According to Adderholdt and Goldberg (1999), gifted children that are plagued specifically with

perfectionistic traits tend to avoid risk-taking activities in which failure is possible, thereby denying themselves opportunities conducive to the development of their potential. Rather than take the risk, they may stick with what is perceived to be 'safe.'

One of the prominent questions in the research on perfectionism in gifted students relates to its source of development. Speirs Neumeister (2004) found that different factors influenced the development either of self-oriented perfectionism, defined as having high expectations or standards for oneself, or of socially prescribed perfectionism, defined as perceiving others as having high expectations for one's performance (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). Findings suggested that gifted, self-oriented perfectionists perceived their perfectionism, developed in part due to parental modeling of perfectionist behaviors, consistent with the findings of other research on perfectionism in the general population (Vieth & Trull, 1999). Additionally, the self-oriented perfectionists attributed their perfectionism to an aspect of their inborn personalities that motivated them to strive for complete mastery of concepts.

In contrast, the socially prescribed participants of Speirs Neumeister's (2004) study described their perfectionism as being rooted in a fear of failure and a perception of self-worth conditional on achievement, which they perceived as results of the high demands and expectations of their authoritarian parents. In this study, the only common reason that both self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionists gave for the development of their perfectionism, however, was a lack of challenge in their early academic experiences. The participants unanimously reported that because their early schoolwork was beneath their ability levels, they learned that they could achieve

perfection effortlessly. Consequently, they began to expect that of themselves, regardless of the academic task.

Defining Gifted/Learning Disabled (GLD)

It is impossible to peruse the literature on giftedness without uncovering the realization that intellectually gifted students, nevertheless, may have a disability. Students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) are the largest subgroup of the 13 specified in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA), comprising approximately 52% of the students served in special education settings, and of this group, up to 3.5% may have dual exceptionalities in gifted and SLD (GLD) (Moon, Brighton, Callahan, & Jarvis, 2008). Frequently these students are easily misunderstood because their giftedness may mask their disabilities and their disabilities may camouflage their talents (Reis and Renzulli, 2004).

The 'gifted handicapped' movement initially concentrated on children with sensory and physical disabilities, but it was not long before scholars began to extend their interest to students with specific learning disabilities. Lovett and Lewandowski (2006) pointed out that the earliest articles on this topic were not empirical studies but, instead, descriptions of eminent (and ostensibly gifted) individuals such as Thomas Edison, Helen Keller, and Albert Einstein, whose biographies suggested deficits that would be characterized today as gifted and disabled.

Review of this literature indicates that proactive attempts to *find* gifted/disabled students began only with the 'mainstreaming' movement within education (Whitmore & Maker, 1985). The 'gifted handicapped' were viewed as languishing in special education

classes where they were denied their rights to develop their gifts and talents fully. It was noted, largely through the realizations of gifted education advocates, that moving these students into the general education classroom allowed them to demonstrate talents and skills that may have been overlooked or possibly ignored in special education classrooms.

The history of GLD definitions includes two critical elements: (a) the masking hypothesis and (b) the assumption that any student's achievement should be judged against that student's potential, rather than against age-typical or grade-typical achievement norms. Recent studies, however, have avoided giving a definition of GLD, except to say that GLD students meet criteria for both giftedness and LD (Lovett & Lewandowski, 2006). An exception to this trend was found in Baum (1990), who described GLD students as those who "exhibit remarkable talents or strengths in some areas and disabling weaknesses in others." The National Association for Gifted Children (1998) went further, describing three kinds of GLD students: "(1) identified gifted students who have subtle learning disabilities, (2) students with a learning disability whose gift has not been identified, and (3) unidentified students whose gifts and learning disabilities may be masked by average school achievement" (p.1).

Identifying the gifted

As the field evolved, a sense of elitism grew and limited access to programming and resources began to become associated with giftedness, as well as with those who were admitted to the "intellectual club" on the basis of their performances on the Stanford-Binet or Wechsler scales (Bracken & Brown, 2006). Due at least in some part to this perception of elitism, as well as social pressure to include more diverse students into

programs for the gifted, leaders in the field began to consider broader methods and procedures for identifying gifted students. Coleman (2003) reiterates the need to use multiple criteria and information sources when identifying gifted children in any context.

Nonetheless, individually administered intelligence tests remain a central component within an evaluation for giftedness. Students in today's world are often identified as gifted if they perform at superior levels on an individual intelligence test (Winner, 2000). The IQ test is almost routinely used to determine whether or not a student qualifies for early gifted placement (Pfeiffer, 2002; Sparrow, Pfeiffer, & Newman, 2005). The intelligence or "IQ" test provides a quantified way to compare the thinking and cognitive skills of individuals who are of a similar chronological age.

The intelligence tests commonly used to evaluate children as intellectually gifted, such as the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition (Roid, 2003) or the Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children, Fourth Edition (Wechsler, 2003), are based on theoretical approaches that sets of cognitive abilities (e.g., verbal abilities, visual-spatial abilities, memory) are interrelated and contribute to an overall estimate of intelligence. Standard scores of 130 and above are typically associated with giftedness, although often that threshold is lowered to include individuals with scores in the superior range of cognitive functioning (120-129).

Content on both of these aforementioned tests contain items to measure both crystallized and fluid abilities (Minton & Pratt, 2006). Because gifted children tend to show greater variability and lower overall performance on processing speed and working memory items which are included in both tests (Roid, 2003), use of full-scale scores that place an increasing emphasis on these factors will likely exclude some children who may

have been identified with earlier or different tests that perhaps had not included such items. When new tests are devised, inclusion of items that are more dependent upon visual-spatial and nonverbal skills, for example, will result in increased scores for children who have strengths in these areas, but lower scores may result for those children who have their strengths in different skill areas.

Minton & Pratt (2006) conducted an interesting study in which gifted and highly gifted students were tested using the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition (SB5). Their scores on the SB5 were then compared with their scores previously earned on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Third Edition (WISC-III). Their SB5 scores were found to be significantly lower than their scores on the WISC-III. Additionally, rank order was not well preserved between the SB5, WISC-III scores, and determination of giftedness. This study demonstrates how it is possible that a child designated as gifted on the basis of IQ the year before the introduction of a new edition of an IQ test would no longer meet the criteria for placement if given the new edition of the test.

Publishers of both the Wechsler and Stanford-Binet tests have provided index scores purported to be helpful in emphasizing the reasoning aspects of intelligence. Nonetheless, these types of examples serve to illustrate the downfalls of using test scores, especially in isolation, when making identification decisions. Fortunately, expanded definitional guidelines reflect the need to assess additional areas of skill beyond one's IQ.

One such additional area that is typically included within a gifted assessment is academic achievement, by way of individually administered and/or group administered achievement tests. Of course, scores from any type of test should not be used in isolation

when making eligibility decisions. Scores from achievement tests represent the student's skills in a specific area, but are more or less a 'snapshot in time.' It is critical to supplement this data with input from parents, teachers, and other educators who are familiar with the student. Clearly, it is important to know about the level at which a child performs academically on a daily basis and over time.

In efforts to gain further understanding about how the student performs and learns beyond the information provided by traditional ability and achievement tests, several other sources of data should be considered. The school psychologist acquires valuable information by reviewing records such as report cards and/or assessments completed by the student, as well as by conducting one or more classroom observations. Interview of the student also can be helpful and should be included as a component of an evaluation for giftedness. Some districts utilize a system that includes teacher nominations or recommendations.

Since the 1960s, efforts to identify gifted and talented students have broadened (Ashman & Vukelich, 1983) and have begun to include teacher-completed rating scales. Among the earliest rating scales for gifted identification were the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS; Renzulli, Smith, White, Callahan, & Hartman, 1976). The SRBCSS and similar scales were remarkable because they added a formal third-party element to the identification procedures. Bracken and Brown (2006) note that many school districts now include diverse means, methods, and criteria to identify gifted students, including a more consistent use of parent and teacher rating scales.

During the past three decades since the SRBCSS was published, the number of behavior rating scales used for the identification of gifted students has grown to more than 30 (Jarosewich, Pfeiffer, & Morris, 2002). Because teachers more frequently interact and observe students in a myriad of contexts, they are in a unique position to serve an important role within the identification process (Bracken & Brown, 2006). Nevertheless, concerns exist regarding teacher qualifications to make judgments about gifted students' behaviors, as well as the validity of those judgments. Rohrer (1995) expressed concern that teachers' preconceived notions of giftedness could preclude children with certain personality traits from gifted programs; however, Rohrer's findings indicated that teachers were able to recognize accurately the potential in students who would not otherwise be considered the stereotypical gifted student.

Another potential problem with the use of behavior rating scales is the possibility that teachers may be unduly influenced by scale headings, item arrangement and organization, or easily recognized item content. Furthermore, teachers may 'fake good' or 'fake bad' in their ratings, depending on their feelings about the students they are rating (Bracken & Brown, 2006). Although validity indices may address the latter issue, not all gifted rating scales have veracity scales to identify inconsistent or questionable ratings (Jarosewich et al., 2002).

Pfeiffer (2003) synthesizes a large amount of information by offering the following set of 'best practice' recommendations for the identification of students who are gifted and talented: have school psychologists gain familiarity with gifted children and their families, recognize the multiple manifestations of giftedness and the developmental nature of talent development, link identification to intervention, employ

multiple assessment measures, include assessments of motivation, consider social and emotional needs, and monitor the recommended interventions.

Identifying GLD students

When identifying giftedness in students with disabilities, Davis and Rimm (1989) emphasized that different procedures are required from those in a typical giftedness assessment. Specifically, they recommended the use of behavior rating scales, of creativity inventories, peer or self-nominations, and prolonged student observations. Brody and Mills (1997) concluded that three factors are especially important when considering whether or not to label a child as GLD: a) evidence of outstanding talent, b) an aptitude-achievement discrepancy, and c) a processing deficit. Their recommendations included scatter analysis, profile analysis, broad definitions of intelligence and giftedness, and ability-achievement discrepancy models of LD (Lovett & Lewandowski, 2006).

Mccoach, Kehle, Bray, and Siegle (2001) proposed 'best practice' guidelines for identifying GLD students. In practice, these researchers endorsed a discrepancy model of LD (but did not discuss a particular discrepancy formula) and recommended the use of IQ tests, achievement tests, and other tools, such as curriculum-based assessments and portfolio reviews. They appeared to differentiate GLD students from non-gifted LD students by using IQ tests (i.e., requiring a high IQ), but they were reluctant to endorse a specific IQ cutoff value. These researchers strongly recommended against scatter and profile analysis, and they were ambiguous on the question of broad definitions of giftedness, endorsing IQ tests but defining giftedness as "an outstanding ability to grapple with complexity" (p. 404).

Neilsen (2002) presented test data taken from the files of more than 300 GLD students in order to produce a set of recommendations. She stressed pragmatic considerations such as state legal definitions of giftedness, and she proposed reforms at the school and district levels to better identify and serve GLD students. Specifically, Neilsen recommended that diagnosticians look for low scores on the Coding and Digit Span subtests of the Wechsler scale, as well as for extreme subtest scatter (Lovett & Lewandowski, 2006). Further, she emphasized the need for comprehensive psychoeducational batteries, an examination of discrepancies between performance on different measures, and flexibility in identification criteria such as cut-off scores.

Silverman (2003) argued that the inspection of separate subtest scores is imperative, because giftedness and LD can 'mask' each other in a variety of ways; consequently, GLD students frequently are undetected or misdiagnosed. She also took into account the facts that additional conditions such as attention problems, learning styles, and anxiety can influence test performance, and that such issues should be considered when interpreting discrepancies between various tests and subtests. Like Nielsen (2002) and Brody and Mills (1997), Silverman endorsed scatter analysis, profile analysis, broad definitions of giftedness, and ability-achievement models of LD.

In reviewing many of the aforementioned recommendations for GLD identification, Lovett and Lewandowski (2006) argued that uneven test score profiles are not a problem per se, and should be ignored when they do not occur in the context of some functional impairment. Further, they suggested that practices such as scatter analysis and profile analysis should be stopped because they have been 'thoroughly discredited' through the empirical literature.

These same researchers also proposed that the diagnosis of GLD should not be based on the masking hypothesis, at least until further research is done to support this postulate. Rather, they proposed that practitioners use operational definitions of giftedness and LD that are psychometrically defensible and useful for classification in school programs. An example they provided is a situation in which a student has an IQ score in the gifted range (i.e., a standard score above 130) but significantly below average achievement (i.e., a standard score below 85); in this case, there is a very substantial discrepancy between IQ and achievement, but it is not the discrepancy per se that leads to the diagnosis. Lovett and Lewandowski (2006) cited their main concern is that the student's ability is substantially above average and that his or her achievement is substantially below average when compared with peers of the same age, rather than making unwarranted intra individual comparisons. In sum, review of the literature exposes the ongoing quandaries of inconsistent opinions regarding best practices for identifying GLD students.

Considerations for multicultural issues and contexts

The culturally diverse are not immune from the ongoing issues related to defining and identifying giftedness. With an increasingly large and diverse student population in U. S. schools, there has been a corresponding press for equitable assessment and representative identification of ethnic and racial minority students for inclusion in special education programs, including programs for the gifted (Bracken, 2008).

Historically, the screening and identification of gifted students has been conducted using verbal measures of intelligence. Pfeiffer (2003) asserted that new

procedures are needed to increase the representation of gifted minority students in gifted and talented programs. Research reviews suggest that traditional assessment processes such as standardized IQ tests that emphasize verbal reasoning, teacher recommendations, and parent questionnaires are particularly insufficient in identifying gifted minority and low-income students (Naglieri & Ford, 2003; Passow & Frasier, 1996).

Serving as an example of the ongoing debate regarding the identification of the academically gifted, Robinson (2008) argued *for* the retention of more traditional tests as a way of ensuring that underrepresented populations are not overlooked in the identification process. The overwhelming majority of the literature, however, appears to indicate that with an under-representation in gifted programs of students who come from culturally diverse backgrounds, low socioeconomic households, or who have limited English proficiency, researchers and others in the field have been prompted to consider alternate measures (Shaunessy, Karnes, & Cobb, 2004).

Perhaps the most commonly mentioned alternate assessments are ones which evaluate nonverbal reasoning or intelligence because such tests are likely to decrease possible language barriers. Examples of these types of tests include, but are not limited to, the Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test (Bracken & McCallum, 1998), and the Naglieri Nonverbal Abilities Test (Naglieri, 1996). The research also suggests a variety of alternate assessment methods including performance-based assessments (Feng & VanTassel-Baska, 2008), which focus on the process that the student uses to derive an answer rather than on whether or not the student can quickly find the right answer; rating scales that assess teachers' and parents' perceptions of students' behavioral functioning (Bracken & Keith, 2004), and on dynamic assessment (VanTassel-Baska, Feng, & Evans,

2007), which usually consists of a test-intervention-retest format, with the focus on the improvement students make after an intervention, specifically based on their learning of cognitive strategies related to mastery of the testing task (Feurerstein, 1986; Kirschenbaum, 1998).

This research study, which examined the process for gifted evaluations in a suburban school district in Pennsylvania, considered these types of multicultural factors. Specifically, analysis of the data helped to determine whether or not an underrepresentation of multicultural students in the gifted program existed in this specific school district, and if so, how the issue(s) can be addressed.

Research Questions

Question 1: What are the demographic characteristics of students referred for assessment to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these demographic characteristics vary greatly by referral source or school building, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Question 2: What assessment procedures were used to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these procedures vary by the school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Question 3: How did children perform on the assessments? Did performance vary by the school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Question 4: What criteria were used to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these criteria vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Question 5: What are the relationships among the various assessment components?

Question 6: What assessment components and/or demographic variables had the greatest influence on eligibility decisions? Did these components vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Chapter 3

Methods

This section of the paper addresses the methodology that was utilized to address the questions posed in this study. Permission to conduct this study was obtained by undergoing a formal approval process by way of the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine Internal Review Board. In addition, permission was obtained from the Director of Special Education of the respective school district being examined.

Source of Data (Participants)

In this study, the source of data was composed of an archival data source with no specific identifiers. To this end, profile analysis of psychoeducational data from each student's file was conducted to explore the various research questions of this investigation. Specifically, the files to be reviewed were those of students who were referred for possible inclusion in the gifted program over the course of four school years in the Wilson School District, a mid-sized, suburban school district located in the state of Pennsylvania. Students who met the aforementioned criteria for inclusion were of various ages, albeit most children at Wilson during the years examined in this study were referred during their elementary school years, and the average student age was expected to reflect this observed trend. A variety of racial/ethnic groups were represented; however, as anticipated, the breakdown reflected the general population of Wilson, which is composed predominantly of Caucasian students. Finally, both gender classifications of male and female were represented within the data source.

The Wilson School District, nestled in the outskirts of Reading in West Lawn, Pennsylvania, serves over 5,700 students, with a faculty consisting of approximately 550 members. Currently, eight elementary schools, two junior high schools, and one senior high school comprise the district, with grades ranging from kindergarten through twelfth.

Demographic variables related to socioeconomic status, ethnicity/race, as well as academic achievement, are available for review on the district's website, which is www.wilsonsd.org. In efforts to provide further clarity about the district's composition, some of that information will be reviewed here.

In regard to income and ethnicity/race classifications, data from the school website indicate that in 2007, only 15% of the student population fell within a range considered to be 'economically disadvantaged.' Data related to ethnicity classifications suggested that less than 1% of the student population was African American, less than 1% of the student population was Hispanic, and that less than 1% of the student population was Asian, indicating that approximately 82% of the student population was Caucasian/Other.

Finally, in regard to academic achievement, the district website outlines a data analysis comparing Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) scores earned by Wilson students (grades 3 through 8, and 11 in 2007) with the scores earned by students (same grades, same year) in the 500 other school districts across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Based upon the results of these PSSA score comparisons, Wilson ranked 58th (of 501) in math and 95th (of 501) in reading. Clearly, this data allow for a better understanding that the Wilson school district is, indeed, highly representative of

Caucasian children who trend on the higher side of achieving and who hail from predominantly middle to upper-middle class backgrounds.

Research Design

This study, descriptive in nature and having an action oriented research perspective, provides the reader with information pertaining to students who have undergone the gifted evaluation process over the course of four school years in the Wilson School District, located in West Lawn, Pennsylvania. Specifically, scores from intelligence tests, academic achievement tests, gifted rating scales, as well as other sources of assessment data (parent/teacher input and/or observations) were examined.

Utilizing an *ex post facto* group comparison design with no specific identifiers, this study separated the data source, or participants, into two separate groups based on the outcome of the identification process, (i.e., whether or not the student was found to be gifted or not gifted). Data analyses were performed, using a statistical software program (SPSS) in order to investigate differences related to specific areas of interest as noted within the research questions of this study.

Measures

Based upon knowledge of the current system for identifying thought-to-be gifted children in the Wilson School District, there are some common types of assessment tools that were likely to be found within each gifted evaluation. Scores from these assessment tools were reviewed within each student's file for the purposes of data analyses. These common assessment tools, which were anticipated to be within most, if not every, gifted

evaluation file reviewed, included a test that measures intelligence, likely the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition (WISC-IV; Wechsler, 2003) or the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition (SB5; Roid, 2003), and a test (or selected subtests) that measures academic achievement, such as the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Second Edition (WIAT-II).

The WISC-IV is an individually administered clinical instrument for assessing the cognitive ability of children aged 6 years 0 months through 16 years 11 months (Wechsler, 2003). This updated version of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Third Edition (WISC-III; Wechsler, 1991) provides subtest and composite scores that represent intellectual functioning in specific cognitive domains, as well as a composite score that is designed to represent general intellectual ability.

The SB5 is another individually administered assessment of intelligence and cognitive abilities. It is appropriate for examinees ranging in age from 2 through 85+ years (Roid, 2003). A Full Scale IQ can be obtained by administering all 10 subtests, and various combinations of the subtests provide other scales. For further discussion about intelligence tests, and how they are utilized for the purposes of identifying giftedness, see Chapter 2.

The Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Second Edition (WIAT-II) is a comprehensive, individually administered test for assessing the achievement of children, adolescents, college students, and adults who are in grades Pre-kindergarten (PreK) through 16 or who are aged 4 through 85 years. The WIAT-II can be used to comprehensively assess a broad range of academic skills in reading, mathematics, written language, and oral language, or to test only in a specified area of need (PsychCorp,

2005). For further discussion about academic achievement tests and how they are utilized within an identification process for giftedness, see Chapter 2.

Before continuing, it is important to acknowledge the reliability and validity of the aforementioned tests. The reliability of a test refers to the accuracy, consistency, and stability of test scores across situations (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). A reliable test has relatively small measurement error and produces consistent measurement results within one administration and also on different occasions (Wechsler, 2004). The validity of a test refers to the degree to which evidence supports the interpretation of test scores for their intended purposes (Wechsler, 2004).

A number of concurrent studies were conducted to provide evidence of the Wechsler scale's reliability and validity (Wechsler, 2004). Detailed descriptions and results from those studies can be reviewed in the test's technical and interpretive manual. Overall, reliability coefficients improved substantially from the WISC-III to the WISC-IV. As for the SB5, reliability and validity studies are reported in detail in the SB5 technical manual (Roid, 2003). The WIAT-II Examiner's Manual Update 2005 (Psych Corp, 2005) provides detailed results from reliability and validity studies as well. All of the aforementioned tests are deemed to be valid and reliable measures either of intellectual ability or of academic achievement.

Based upon knowledge of the current system for identifying thought-to-be gifted children in the Wilson School District, rating scales that are designed to evaluate the presence or absence of characteristics associated with giftedness were likely to be found in some, but not all, of the gifted evaluations examined in this study. Two scales that

were used at Wilson by some of the school psychologists included the Gifted Evaluation Scale: Second Edition (GES-2) and/or the Williams Scale.

The GES-2, a comprehensive instrument designed to respond to the construct defined, is most widely accepted as representing the five characteristics of giftedness (intellectual, creativity, specific academic aptitude, leadership ability, and performing and/or visual arts) in educational environments (McCarney & Anderson, 2000). Results derived from the GES-2, in conjunction with other information, may be used to support a diagnosis of giftedness. The second chapter of the GES-2 manual provides detailed information relevant to the reliability and validity of this instrument.

The Williams Scale is another rating scale designed to evaluate the extent to which characteristics associated with giftedness are observed or perceived in a student. The William Scale allows teachers and parents to rate various thinking and feeling behaviors often associated with gifted, talented and creative children in the following domains: fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, curiosity, imagination, complexity, and risk-taking (Williams, 1993). For further discussion and information about gifted rating scales and how they are utilized within an identification process for gifted evaluations, see Chapter 2.

In an effort to learn more about how a student learns and what characteristics he/she exhibits, valuable information can be gained through several other venues including, but not limited to, review of records including report card grades, and/or other assessments completed by the student, classroom observations, and teacher and parent input, which may be sought either through checklists or through an open-ended question format.

Procedures - Data Collection

In this study, an archival data source consisted of the confidential gifted evaluation reports of students that were referred for potential inclusion in the district's gifted program, regardless of outcome, over four school years. Each report was assigned an ID number, which was kept confidential and became part of the data base. This confidential ID number not only served to "identify" each report, but also helped to insure the privacy and anonymity of each student. Data were taken from each numbered file and transferred to a coding sheet, which then was entered into the statistical software program, SPSS. Data variables included date of birth, gender, ethnicity if noted, referral source, school building, grade level, psychologist (identified through a number), all scaled scores from subtests and standard scores from composite domains on the intelligence test, standard scores on the achievement test, scaled and/or standard scores from a gifted rating scale, if available, and finally, quantified ratings representing the qualitative content found in teacher input and/or parent input. For purposes of data collection and subsequent analysis through SPSS, teacher and parent input was analyzed and accordingly assigned a numeric value, utilizing a Likert scale system of 1 to 4. A rating of 1 indicated "no recommendation;" a rating of 2 indicated a "marginal recommendation;" a rating of 3 indicated a "recommendation;" and a rating of 4 indicated a "strong recommendation."

Chapter 4

Results

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses completed to address each research question. Analyses are organized and presented according to the six research questions stated in Chapter 2.

Question 1: What are the demographic characteristics of students referred for assessment to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these demographic characteristics vary greatly by referral source or by school building, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

The data set was examined to determine the demographic characteristics of students referred for assessment to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program.

Table 1 shows the frequency counts for the two referral sources: teachers and parents.

Table 1

Frequency of referrals by source

Referral Source	n	%
Teacher	75	44.6
Parent	93	55.4

Table 2 shows the frequency counts of referrals from each building in the school district.

Table 2

Frequency of referrals from each building

Building	n	%
1	35	20.8
2	2	1.2
3	36	21.4
4	22	13.1
5	24	14.3
6	22	13.1
7	13	7.7
8	2	1.2
9	11	6.5
10	1	.6

Table 3 shows the frequency of gender of referred children.

Table 3

Frequency of gender of referred children

Gender	n	%
Female	78	46.4
Male	90	53.6

Table 4 shows the frequency of ethnic background of referred children.

Table 4

Frequency of ethnic background of referred children

Ethnicity	n	%
Caucasian	138	82.1
Hispanic	12	7.1
Asian	9	5.4
African American	6	3.6
Other	3	1.8

Table 5 shows the frequency of other exceptionality of referred children.

Table 5

Frequency of other exceptionality of referred children

Other Exceptionality	n	%
No	155	92.3
Yes	13	7.7

Table 6 shows the frequency of age of referred children.

Table 6

Frequency of age of referred children

Age in Years	n	%
5	1	.6
6	11	6.5
7	34	20.2
8	36	21.4
9	45	26.8
10	25	14.9
11	10	6.0
12	3	1.8
14	2	1.2

Table 7 shows the frequency of grade of referred children.

Table 7

Frequency of grade of referred children

Grade	n	%
K	2	1.2
1	18	10.7
2	43	25.6
3	39	23.2
4	39	23.2
5	19	11.3
6	5	3.0
7	1	.6
8	2	1.2

Table 8 shows the frequency of referrals from each source in each building in the school district.

Table 8

Frequency of referrals from each source in each building in the school district

Building	Teacher Referral		Parent Referral	
	n	%	n	%
1	21	28	14	15.1
2	1	1.3	1	1.1
3	14	18.7	22	23.7
4	9	12.0	13	14.0
5	10	13.3	14	15.1
6	13	17.3	9	9.7
7	3	4.0	10	10.8
8	0	0	2	2.2
9	3	4.0	8	8.6
10	1	1.3	0	0

Table 9 shows the frequency of referrals by teacher within school buildings.

Table 9

Frequency of referrals by teacher within school building

Building	Teacher ID #	n	%
1	1	2	10.5
	2	2	10.5
	3	1	5.3
	4	1	5.3
	7	1	5.3
	8	1	5.3
	10	2	10.5
	11	4	21.1
	16	1	5.3

	17	1	5.3
	20	1	5.3
	21	1	5.3
	22	1	5.3
2	24	1	100
3	3	2	22.2
	26	2	22.2
	27	1	11.1
	32	1	11.1
	33	1	11.1
	35	1	11.1
	36	1	11.1
4	36	1	33.3
	46	1	33.3
	49	1	33.3
5	51	1	25
	52	1	25
	55	1	25
	59	1	25
6	23	2	25
	24	2	25
	61	2	25
	63	1	12.5
	64	1	12.5
7	68	1	50
	69	1	50
9	71	1	100

Table 10 shows the frequency of referrals by source and by gender of the referred child.

Table 10

Frequency of referrals by source and by gender of referred child

Gender	Teacher Referral		Parent Referral	
	n	%	n	%
Girls	35	46.7	43	46.2
Boys	40	53.3	50	53.8

Table 11 shows the frequency of referrals by source and by ethnic background of the referred child.

Table 11

Frequency of referrals by source and by ethnic background of referred child

Ethnicity	Teacher Referral		Parent Referral	
	n	%	n	%
Caucasian	64	85.3	74	79.6
Hispanic	6	8	6	6.5
Asian	2	2.7	7	7.5
African American	3	4	3	3.2
Other	0	0	3	3.3

Table 12 shows the frequency of referrals by source and by other exceptionality of the referred child.

Table 12

Frequency of referrals by source and by other exceptionality of referred child

Exceptionality Status	Teacher Referral		Parent Referral	
	n	%	n	%
No Exceptionality	71	94.7	84	90.3
Other Exceptionality	4	5.3	9	9.7

Table 13 shows the frequency of referrals by source and by age of the referred child.

Table 13

Frequency of referrals by source and by age of referred child

Age	Teacher Referral		Parent Referral	
	n	%	n	%
5	0	0	1	1.1
6	2	2.7	9	9.7
7	17	23	17	18.3
8	14	18.9	22	23.7
9	23	31.1	22	23.7
10	8	10.8	17	18.3
11	8	10.8	2	2.2
12	2	2.7	1	1.1
14	0	0	2	2.2

Table 14 shows the frequency of referrals by source and by grade of the referred child.

Table 14

Frequency of referrals by source and by grade of referred child

Grade	Teacher Referral		Parent Referral	
	n	%	n	%
K	0	0	2	2.2
1	6	8.0	12	12.9
2	20	26.7	23	24.7
3	15	20	24	25.8
4	18	24	21	22.6
5	10	13.3	9	9.7
6	5	6.7	0	0
7	1	1.3	0	0
8	0	0	2	2.2

Table 15 shows the frequency of referrals by building and by gender of the referred child.

Table 15

Frequency of referrals by building and by gender of referred child

Building	Female		Male	
	n	%	n	%
1	18	23.1	17	18.9
2	0	0.0	2	2.2
3	19	24.4	17	18.9
4	6	7.7	16	17.8
5	10	12.8	14	15.6
6	15	19.2	7	7.8
7	6	7.7	7	7.8
8	0	0.0	2	2.2
9	4	5.1	7	7.8
10	0	0.0	1	1.1

Table 16 shows the frequency of referrals by building and by ethnic background of the referred child.

Table 16

Frequency of referrals by building and by ethnic background of referred child

Building	Ethnicity									
	Caucasian		Hispanic		Asian		African-American		Other	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	27	19.6	6	50	0	0	1	16.7	1	50
2	2	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	30	21.7	2	16.7	1	11.1	3	50	0	0
4	17	12.3	1	8.3	4	44.4	0	0	0	0
5	20	14.5	0	0	2	22.2	1	16.7	1	100
6	19	13.8	1	8.3	1	11.1	1	16.7	0	0
7	9	6.5	2	16.7	1	11.1	0	0	1	50
8	2	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	1	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 17 shows the frequency of referrals by building and by other exceptionality of the referred child.

Table 17

Frequency of referrals by building and by other exceptionality of referred child

Building	No Exceptionality		Other Exceptionality	
	n	%	n	%
1	31	20	4	30.8
2	1	.6	1	7.7
3	34	21.9	2	15.4
4	22	14.2	0	0

5	24	15.5	0	0
6	17	11	5	38.5
7	12	7.7	1	7.7
8	2	1.3	0	0
9	11	7.1	0	0
10	1	.6	0	0

Table 18 shows the frequency of referrals by building and by the age of the referred child.

Table 18

Frequency of referrals by building and by age of referred child

Building	Age															
	5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12		14	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	0	0	0	0	9	26.5	12	33.3	7	15.6	2	8	3	30	1	33.3	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	100	5	45.5	5	14.7	6	16.7	15	33.3	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	2	18.2	2	5.9	5	13.9	8	17.8	3	12	2	20	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	7	20.6	4	11.1	7	15.6	5	20	0	0	1	33.3	0	0
6	0	0	1	9.1	9	26.5	5	13.9	2	4.4	4	16	1	10	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	2	18.2	1	2.9	0	0	4	8.9	4	16	2	20	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
9	0	0	1	9.1	0	0	4	11.1	2	4.4	2	8	2	20	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

Table 19 shows the frequency of referrals by building and by grade of the referred child.

Table 19

Frequency of referrals by building and by grade of referred child

Building	Grade															
	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	0	0	3	16.7	11	25.6	11	28.2	4	10.3	4	21.1	2	40	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	2.3	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	50	6	33.3	7	16.3	12	30.8	9	23.1	1	5.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	50	1	5.6	4	9.3	5	12.8	9	23.1	1	5.3	1	20	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	9	20.9	5	12.8	8	20.5	1	5.3	1	20	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	4	22.2	9	20.9	2	5.1	3	7.7	4	21.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	3	16.7	0	0	1	2.6	5	12.8	4	21.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
9	0	0	1	5.6	2	4.7	3	7.7	1	2.6	3	15.8	1	20	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

Question 2: What assessment procedures were used to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these procedures vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or by referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Table 20 shows the frequency of assessment instruments used to determine eligibility.

Table 20

Frequency of assessment instruments used to determine eligibility

Test/Subtest	n
Intelligence Test	
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition (WISC-IV)	162
Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales (SB5)	12
Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI-III)	1
Achievement Test	
Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-Second Edition (WIAT-II) subtest	
WIAT-II Word Reading (WIAT-II WR)	165
WIAT-II Numerical Operations (WIAT-II NO)	165
WIAT-II Spelling (WIAT-II SP)	164
WIAT-II Math Reasoning (WIAT-II MR)	7
WIAT-II Reading Comprehension (WIAT-II RC)	7
WIAT-II Written Expression (WIAT-II WE)	4
Teacher Input Qualitative Rating	
No Recommendation	5
Marginal Recommendation	21
Recommendation	67
Strong Recommendation	71
Parent Input Qualitative Rating	
No Recommendation	1
Marginal Recommendation	11
Recommendation	46
Strong Recommendation	85

Question 3: How did the children perform on the assessments? Did performance vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Table 21 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges.

Table 21

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
WISC IV/SB5*								
Verbal	69	41.1	28	16.7	26	15.5	45	26.8
Nonverbal	73	43.5	28	16.7	29	17.3	38	22.6
WM	103	61.3	32	19	20	11.9	12	7.1
PS	117	69.6	23	13.7	9	5.4	11	6.5
FSIQ	53	31.5	32	19	39	23.2	44	26.2
GAI	46	27.4	31	18.5	29	17.3	54	32.1
WIAT-II								
WR	97	57.7	24	14.3	26	15.5	18	10.7
RC	7	4.2						
NO	84	50	21	12.5	23	13.7	37	22
MR	2	1.2	2	1.2	1	.6	2	1.2
SP	86	51.2	28	16.7	27	16.1	23	13.7
WE	3	1.8					1	.6

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 22 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by referral source.

Table 22

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by referral source

	WISC-IV/SB5*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Teacher Referral								
Verbal	30	40	12	16	14	18.7	19	25.3
Nonverbal	27	36	13	17.3	15	20	20	26.7
WM	49	65.3	14	18.7	7	9.3	5	6.7
PS	52	72.2	13	18.1	3	4.2	4	5.6
FSIQ	22	29.3	13	17.3	17	22.7	23	30.7
GAI	21	29.2	11	15.3	12	16.7	28	38.9
Parent Referral								
Verbal	39	41.9	16	17.2	12	12.9	26	28
Nonverbal	46	49.5	15	16.1	14	15.1	18	19.4
WM	54	58.7	18	19.6	13	14.1	7	7.6
PS	65	73.9	10	11.4	6	6.8	7	8
FSIQ	31	33.3	19	20.4	22	23.7	21	22.6
GAI	25	28.4	20	22.7	17	19.3	26	29.5

	WIAT-II							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Teacher Referral								
WR	45	60.8	12	16.2	12	16.2	5	6.8
RC	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO	34	45.9	11	14.9	10	13.5	19	25.7
MR	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25

SP	39	53.4	10	13.7	15	20.5	9	12.3
WE	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parent Referral								
WR	52	57.1	12	13.2	14	15.4	13	14.3
RC	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO	50	54.9	10	11	13	14.3	18	19.8
MR	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3
SP	47	51.6	18	19.8	12	13.2	14	15.4
WE	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 23 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by school psychologist.

Table 23

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by school psychologist

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*								
School Psychologist								
1	18	34.6	6	11.5	13	25	15	28.8
2	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
3	2	33.3	0	0	1	16.7	3	50
4	1	25.0	3	75	0	0	0	0
5	3	33.3	2	22.2	3	33.3	1	11.1
6	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50
7	1	16.7	0	0	1	16.7	4	66.7
8	36	60	10	16.7	6	10	8	13.3
9	7	29.2	5	20.8	2	8.3	10	41.7
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100

WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	21	40.4	12	23.1	7	13.5	12	23.1
2	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	3	50	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7
4	0	0	1	25	1	25	2	50
5	4	44.4	3	33.3	1	11.1	1	11.1
6	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50
7	2	33.3	0	0	2	33.3	2	33.3
8	27	45	9	15	10	16.7	14	23.3
9	13	54.2	2	8.3	6	25	3	12.5
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
11	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50

WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	31	59.6	13	25	3	5.8	5	9.6
2	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50	0	0
4	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3
5	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2	0	0
6	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
7	3	50	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7
8	45	75	6	10	5	8.3	4	6.7
9	15	62.5	5	20.8	3	12.5	1	4.2
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
11	1	50	0	0	1	5	0	0

WISC-IV Processing Speed

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	43	82.7	6	11.5	1	1.9	2	3.8
2	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0
4	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3
5	6	66.7	0	0	2	22.2	1	11.1
6	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
7	3	50	1	16.7	0	0	2	33.3
8	41	77.4	8	15.1	2	3.8	2	3.8
9	14	58.3	5	20.8	4	16.7	1	4.2
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
11	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50

WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	18	34.6	7	13.5	13	25	14	26.9
2	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	16.7
4	0	0	1	25	1	25	2	50
5	1	11.1	2	22.2	3	33.3	3	33.3
6	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
7	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	3	50
8	28	46.7	10	16.7	10	16.7	12	20
9	3	12.5	9	37.5	6	25	6	25
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
11	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50

WISC-IV GAI

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	14	26.9	12	23.1	7	13.5	19	36.5
2	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
3	2	33.3	0	0	1	16.7	3	50
4	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
5	3	33.3	2	22.2	2	22.2	2	22.2
6	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
7	1	16.7	0	0	1	16.7	4	66.7
8	20	37.7	11	20.8	8	15.1	14	26.4
9	6	25	3	12.5	7	29.2	8	33.3
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
11	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50

WIAT-II Word Reading (WR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	31	59.6	8	15.4	8	15.4	5	9.6
2	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	3	50	0	0	2	33.3	1	16.7
4	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3
5	5	55.6	1	11.1	3	33.3	0	0
6	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50
7	3	50	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7
8	40	67.8	9	15.3	7	11.9	3	5.1
9	11	45.8	5	20.8	4	16.7	4	16.7
10	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

WIAT-II Reading Comprehension (RC)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Numerical Operations (NO)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	31	59.6	4	7.7	5	9.6	12	23.1
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
3	3	50	0	0	2	33.3	1	16.7
4	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7
5	8	88.9	0	0	0	0	1	11.1
6	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
7	2	33.3	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3
8	29	49.2	9	15.3	12	20.3	9	15.3
9	10	41.7	4	16.7	3	12.5	7	29.2
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

WIAT-II Math Reasoning (MR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	16.7	1	16.7
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

WIAT-II Spelling (SP)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	28	54.9	6	11.8	9	17.6	8	15.7
2	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
3	3	50	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7
4	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3
5	4	44.4	3	33.3	2	22.2	0	0
6	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50
7	3	50	2	33.3	0	0	1	16.7
8	30	50.8	11	18.6	11	18.6	7	11.9
9	16	66.7	3	12.5	3	12.5	2	8.3
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

WIAT-II Written Expression (WE)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist								
1	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 24 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by building.

Table 24

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by building

	WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	12	34.3	4	11.4	10	28.6	9	25.7
2	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
3	17	47.2	10	27.8	2	5.6	7	19.4
4	9	40.9	3	13.6	5	22.7	5	22.7
5	13	54.2	5	20.8	2	8.3	4	16.7
6	9	40.9	2	9.1	4	18.2	7	31.8
7	3	23.1	1	7.7	1	7.7	8	61.5
8	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50
9	5	45.5	1	9.1	1	9.1	4	36.4
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	16	45.7	9	25.7	5	14.3	5	14.3
2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	14	38.9	7	19.4	8	22.2	7	19.4
4	7	31.8	1	4.5	5	22.7	9	40.9
5	13	54.2	2	8.3	3	12.5	6	25
6	7	31.8	7	31.8	3	13.6	5	22.7
7	7	53.8	0	0	2	15.4	4	30.8
8	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0

9	6	54.5	0	0	3	27.3	2	18.2
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	22	62.9	9	25.7	2	5.7	2	5.7
2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	20	57.1	5	14.3	5	14.3	5	14.3
4	14	63.6	2	9.1	5	22.7	1	4.5
5	16	66.7	5	20.8	1	4.2	2	8.3
6	15	68.2	5	22.7	2	9.1	0	0
7	5	38.5	3	23.1	3	23.1	2	15.4
8	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
9	8	72.7	2	18.2	1	9.1	0	0
10	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV Processing Speed

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	29	82.9	5	14.3	1	2.9	0	0
2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	24	77.4	1	3.2	0	0	6	19.4
4	16	80	3	15	1	5	0	0
5	15	65.2	6	26.1	0	0	2	8.7
6	16	72.7	1	4.5	4	18.2	1	4.5
7	6	46.2	4	30.8	2	15.4	1	7.7
8	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0
9	7	63.6	3	27.3	0	0	1	9.1
10	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	14	40	4	11.4	9	25.7	8	22.9
2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	12	33.3	7	19.4	9	25	8	22.2
4	5	22.7	6	27.3	3	13.6	8	36.4
5	11	45.8	3	12.5	6	25	4	16.7
6	6	27.3	3	13.6	6	27.3	7	31.8
7	0	0	4	30.8	4	30.8	5	38.5
8	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50
9	3	27.3	3	27.3	2	18.2	3	27.3
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV GAI

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	12	34.3	5	14.3	5	14.3	13	37.1
2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
3	9	29	9	29	4	12.9	9	29
4	5	25	3	15	3	15	9	45
5	9	39.1	4	17.4	5	21.7	5	21.7
6	5	22.7	4	18.2	4	18.2	9	40.9
7	1	7.7	2	15.4	6	46.2	4	30.8
8	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50
9	4	36.4	1	9.1	2	18.2	4	36.4
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Word Reading (WR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	20	57.1	6	17.1	6	17.1	3	8.6
2	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
3	19	54.3	5	14.3	5	14.3	6	17.1
4	12	54.5	3	13.6	4	18.2	3	13.6
5	15	68.2	4	18.2	3	13.6	0	0
6	16	72.7	1	4.5	4	18.2	1	4.5
7	8	61.5	1	7.7	0	0	4	30.8
8	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
9	6	54.5	2	18.2	2	18.2	1	9.1
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Reading Comprehension (RC)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Numerical Operations (NO)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	23	65.7	3	8.6	3	8.6	6	17.1
2	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50
3	18	51.4	3	8.6	3	8.6	11	31.4
4	5	22.7	4	18.2	7	31.8	6	27.3

5	14	63.6	2	9.1	4	18.2	2	9.1
6	17	77.3	3	13.6	1	4.5	1	4.5
7	2	15.4	3	23.1	2	15.4	6	46.2
8	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
9	4	36.4	3	27.3	2	18.2	2	18.2
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

WIAT-II Math Reasoning (MR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	1	33.3
3	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
6	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Spelling (SP)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	21	60	5	14.3	3	8.6	6	17.1
2	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
3	14	41.2	7	20.6	7	20.6	6	17.6
4	9	40.9	4	18.2	4	18.2	5	22.7
5	9	40.9	6	27.3	5	22.7	2	9.1
6	17	77.3	1	4.5	3	13.6	1	4.5
7	7	53.8	2	15.4	2	15.4	2	15.4
8	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
9	8	72.7	2	18.2	0	0	1	9.1
10	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

WIAT-II Written Expression (WE)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 25 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by gender.

Table 25

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by gender

WISC-IV/SB5*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Females								
Verbal	34	43.6	14	17.9	11	14.1	19	24.4
Nonverbal	32	41	16	20.5	16	20.5	14	17.9
WM	45	58.4	16	20.8	6	7.8	10	13
PS	49	65.3	12	16	7	9.3	7	9.3
GAI	21	28	16	21.3	15	20	23	30.7
Males								
Verbal	35	38.9	14	15.6	15	16.7	26	28.9
Nonverbal	41	45.6	12	13.3	13	14.4	24	26.7
WM	58	64.4	16	17.8	14	15.6	2	2.2
PS	68	80	11	12.9	2	2.4	4	4.7
GAI	25	29.4	15	17.6	14	16.5	31	36.5

WIAT-II

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Females								
WR	44	57.9	9	11.8	12	15.8	11	14.5
RC	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO	46	60.5	8	10.5	7	9.2	15	19.7
MR	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
SP	34	44.7	15	19.7	14	18.4	13	17.1
WE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Males								
WR	53	59.6	15	16.9	14	15.7	7	7.9
RC	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO	38	42.7	13	14.6	16	18	22	24.7
MR	2	33.3	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3
SP	52	59.1	13	14.8	13	14.8	10	11.4
WE	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 26 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific ranges by ethnic group.

Table 26

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific ranges by ethnic group

	WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	54	39.1	23	16.7	21	15.2	40	29
Hispanic	5	41.7	1	8.3	4	33.3	2	16.7
Asian	6	66.7	1	11.1	0	0	2	22.2
African American	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0
Other	0	0	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3

	WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	62	44.9	23	16.7	19	13.8	34	24.6
Hispanic	3	25	3	25	4	33.3	2	16.7
Asian	4	44.4	1	11.1	3	33.3	1	11.1
African American	2	33.3	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7
Other	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	84	61.3	25	18.2	19	13.9	9	6.6
Hispanic	8	66.7	2	16.7	0	0	2	16.7
Asian	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1	0	0
African American	4	66.7	1	16.7	0	0	1	16.7
Other	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV Processing Speed

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	101	77.1	16	12.2	6	4.6	8	6.1
Hispanic	4	36.4	5	45.5	1	9.1	1	9.1
Asian	7	77.8	1	11.1	0	0	1	11.1
African American	3	50	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7
Other	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	44	31.9	26	18.8	30	21.7	38	27.5
Hispanic	3	25	3	25	2	16.7	4	33.3
Asian	3	33.3	3	33.3	2	22.2	1	11.1
African American	2	33.3	0	0	3	50	1	16.7
Other	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7	0	0

WISC-IV GAI

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	37	28.2	25	19.1	22	16.8	47	35.9
Hispanic	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3	3	27.3
Asian	4	44.4	3	33.3	0	0	2	22.2
African American	2	33.3	0	0	3	50	1	16.7
Other	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3

WIAT-II Word Reading (WR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	85	62.5	20	14.7	19	14	12	8.8
Hispanic	6	50	0	0	3	25	3	25
Asian	3	37.5	1	12.5	2	25	2	25
African American	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3	0	0
Other	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3

WIAT-II Reading Comprehension (RC)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Numerical Operations (NO)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	68	50	18	13.2	19	14	31	22.8
Hispanic	4	33.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	5	41.7
Asian	5	62.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	1	12.5
African American	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0
Other	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3	0	0

WIAT-II Math Reasoning (MR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	2	28.6	2	28.6	1	14.3	2	28.6
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Spelling (SP)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	75	55.6	23	17	20	14.8	17	12.6
Hispanic	1	8.3	2	16.7	5	41.7	4	33.3
Asian	4	50	1	12.5	2	25	1	12.5
African American	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0
Other	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3

	WIAT-II Written Expression (WE)							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	3	75	0	0	0	0	1	25
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 27 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by other exceptionality.

Table 27

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by other exceptionality

	WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	67	43.2	27	17.4	22	14.2	39	25.2
Other Exceptionality	2	15.4	1	7.7	4	30.8	6	46.2

WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	68	43.9	25	16.1	28	18.1	34	21.9
Other Exceptionality	5	38.5	3	23.1	1	7.7	4	30.8

WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	95	61.7	27	17.5	20	13	12	7.8
Other Exceptionality	8	61.5	5	38.5	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV Processing Speed

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	105	71.4	23	15.6	9	6.1	10	6.8
Other Exceptionality	12	92.3	0	0	0	0	1	7.7

WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	46	31.3	26	17.7	26	17.7	49	33.3
Other Exceptionality	0	0	5	38.5	3	23.1	5	38.5

WIAT-II Word Reading (WR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	88	57.9	22	14.5	24	15.8	18	11.8
Other Exceptionality	9	69.2	2	15.4	2	15.4	0	0

WIAT-II Reading Comprehension (RC)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Exceptionality	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Numerical Operations (NO)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	73	48	20	13.2	22	14.5	37	24.3
Other Exceptionality	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7	0	0

WIAT-II Math Reasoning (MR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
Other Exceptionality	2	50	1	25	0	0	1	25

WIAT-II Spelling (SP)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	76	50.3	25	16.6	27	17.9	23	15.2
Other Exceptionality	10	76.9	3	23.1	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Written Expression (WE)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Exceptionality Status								
No Exceptionality	3	75	0	0	0	0	1	25
Other Exceptionality	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 28 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by age.

Table 28

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by age

	WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
6	4	36.4	2	18.2	1	9.1	4	36.4
7	17	50	6	17.6	6	17.6	5	14.7
8	16	44.4	4	11.1	5	13.9	11	30.6
9	16	35.6	9	20	9	20	11	24.4
10	10	40	4	16	4	16	7	28
11	3	30	1	10	1	10	5	50
12	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50

	WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
6	0	0	1	9.1	1	9.1	9	81.8
7	7	20.6	10	29.4	8	23.5	9	26.5
8	18	50	5	13.9	8	22.2	5	13.9
9	25	55.6	6	13.3	7	15.6	7	15.6
10	15	60	3	12	3	12	4	16
11	4	40	1	10	2	20	3	30
12	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	4	36.4	3	27.3	3	27.3	1	9.1
7	13	38.2	10	29.4	5	14.7	6	17.6
8	25	69.4	7	19.4	3	8.3	1	2.8
9	31	68.9	8	17.8	4	8.9	2	4.4
10	20	80	2	8	1	4	2	8
11	6	60	1	10	3	30	0	0
12	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0

WISC-IV Processing Speed

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	7	63.6	3	27.3	0	0	1	9.1
7	22	66.7	6	18.2	2	6.1	3	9.1
8	30	83.3	0	0	3	8.3	3	8.3
9	30	71.4	6	14.3	2	4.8	4	9.5
10	17	77.3	4	18.2	1	4.5	0	0
11	6	60	4	40	0	0	0	0
12	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
6	0	0	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7
7	11	32.4	3	8.8	7	20.6	13	38.2
8	15	41.7	4	11.1	8	22.2	9	25
9	13	28.9	11	24.4	15	33.3	6	13.3
10	9	36	8	32	4	16	4	16
11	3	30	2	20	2	20	3	30
12	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50

WISC-IV GAI

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7
7	10	30.3	6	18.2	7	21.2	10	30.3
8	14	38.9	2	5.6	5	13.9	15	41.7
9	13	31	11	26.2	8	19	10	23.8
10	5	22.7	7	31.8	5	22.7	5	22.7
11	1	10	3	30	2	20	4	40
12	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50

WIAT-II Word Reasoning (WR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	9.1	0	0	2	18.2	8	72.7
7	11	32.4	8	23.5	10	29.4	5	14.7
8	24	66.7	4	11.1	5	13.9	3	8.3
9	28	63.6	10	22.7	4	9.1	2	4.5
10	23	95.8	0	0	1	4.2	0	0
11	8	80	1	10	1	10	0	0
12	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0

WIAT-II Reading Comprehension (RC)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Numerical Operations (NO)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	7	63.6	2	18.2	0	0	2	18.2
7	21	61.8	5	14.7	3	8.8	5	14.7
8	24	66.7	4	11.1	5	13.9	3	8.3
9	18	40.9	7	15.9	7	15.9	12	27.3
10	8	33.3	1	4.2	5	20.8	10	41.7
11	4	40	2	20	2	20	2	20
12	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	2	66.7
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50

WIAT-II Math Reasoning (MR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7
9	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Spelling (SP)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	3	27.3	2	18.2	3	27.3	3	27.3
7	17	50	4	11.8	7	20.6	6	17.6
8	23	63.9	4	11.1	2	5.6	7	19.4
9	19	44.2	10	23.3	8	18.6	6	14
10	13	54.2	6	25	4	16.7	1	4.2
11	9	90	1	10	0	0	0	0
12	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0

WIAT-II Written Expression (WE)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
8	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 29 shows the frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by grade.

Table 29

Frequency of intellectual and achievement test scores within specific score ranges by grade

	WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
1	8	44.4	4	22.2	0	0	6	33.3
2	21	48.8	8	18.6	9	20.9	5	11.6
3	14	35.9	5	12.8	7	17.9	13	33.3
4	19	48.7	6	15.4	6	15.4	8	20.5
5	4	21.1	3	15.8	2	10.5	10	52.6
6	2	40	0	0	1	20	2	40
7	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

	WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*							
	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50
1	3	16.7	2	11.1	3	16.7	10	55.6
2	12	27.9	8	18.6	12	27.9	11	25.6
3	23	59	7	17.9	5	12.8	4	10.3
4	19	48.7	7	17.9	6	15.4	7	17.9
5	12	63.2	1	5.3	1	5.3	5	26.3
6	3	60	0	0	2	40	0	0
7	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
8	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	8	44.4	5	27.8	4	22.2	1	5.6
2	19	44.2	12	27.9	5	11.6	7	16.3
3	29	74.4	6	15.4	4	10.3	0	0
4	28	71.8	6	15.4	2	5.1	3	7.7
5	13	68.4	2	10.5	3	15.8	1	5.3
6	4	80	0	0	1	20	0	0
7	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0

WISC-IV Processing Speed

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	11	61.1	5	27.8	0	0	2	11.1
2	31	73.8	4	9.5	3	7.1	4	9.5
3	32	84.2	2	5.3	2	5.3	2	5.3
4	23	65.7	7	20	2	5.7	3	8.6
5	12	66.7	5	27.8	1	5.6	0	0
6	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0

WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
1	3	16.7	1	5.6	3	16.7	11	61.1
2	15	34.9	4	9.3	10	23.3	14	32.6
3	17	43.6	3	7.7	13	33.3	6	15.4
4	10	25.6	14	35.9	9	23.1	6	15.4
5	5	26.3	6	31.6	2	10.5	6	31.6
6	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0
7	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50

WISC-IV GAI

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
1	2	11.1	3	16.7	2	11.1	11	61.1
2	16	38.1	4	9.5	7	16.7	15	35.7
3	12	31.6	8	21.1	7	18.4	11	28.9
4	12	34.3	6	17.1	9	25.7	8	22.9
5	1	5.6	8	44.4	3	16.7	6	33.3
6	2	40	1	20	0	0	2	40
7	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
8	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50

WIAT-II Word Reading (WR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
1	4	22.2	2	11.1	3	16.7	9	50
2	18	41.9	8	18.6	11	25.6	6	14
3	28	73.7	6	15.8	4	10.5	0	0
4	27	71.1	6	15.8	3	7.9	2	5.3
5	16	84.2	1	5.3	2	10.5	0	0
6	4	80	0	0	1	20	0	0
7	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0

WIAT-II Reading Comprehension (RC)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
1	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Numerical Operations (NO)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	12	66.7	3	16.7	1	5.6	2	11.1
2	29	67.4	5	11.6	2	4.7	7	16.3
3	23	60.5	6	15.8	5	13.2	4	10.5
4	10	26.3	5	13.2	11	28.9	12	31.6
5	5	26.3	2	10.5	2	10.5	10	52.6
6	4	80	0	0	1	20	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
8	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50

WIAT-II Math Reasoning (MR)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
3	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

WIAT-II Spelling (SP)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	8	44.4	2	11.1	3	16.7	5	27.8
2	21	48.8	6	14	8	18.6	8	18.6
3	23	60.5	8	21.1	2	5.3	5	13.2
4	16	43.2	8	21.6	9	24.3	4	10.8
5	13	68.4	3	15.8	2	10.5	1	5.3
6	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0

WIAT-II Written Expression (WE)

	≤119		120-124		125-129		≥130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
2	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 30 shows the frequency counts of teacher and parent input scores.

Table 30

Frequency of teacher and parent input scores

	Teacher Input		Parent Input	
	n	%	n	%
No Recommendation	5	3	1	.6
Marginal Recommendation	23	13.7	11	6.5
Recommendation	66	39.3	48	28.6
Strong Recommendation	71	42.3	89	53

Table 31 shows the frequency of teacher and parent input scores by school building.

Table 31

Frequency of teacher and parent input scores by school building

	Teacher Input							
	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	0	0	3	8.6	20	57.1	12	34.3
2	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0
3	3	8.6	7	20	11	31.4	14	40
4	0	0	3	13.6	7	31.8	12	54.5
5	1	4.2	2	8.3	14	58.3	7	29.2
6	0	0	7	31.8	5	22.7	10	45.5
7	0	0	0	0	4	33.3	8	66.7
8	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	3	27.3	8	72.7
10	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Parent Input							
	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	0	0	3	9.1	15	45.5	15	45.5
2	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50
3	0	0	2	6.7	8	26.7	20	66.7
4	0	0	0	0	6	31.6	13	68.4
5	1	5	2	10	8	40	9	45
6	0	0	3	14.3	3	14.3	15	71.4
7	0	0	0	0	4	30.8	9	69.2
8	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
9	0	0	0	0	3	37.5	5	62.5
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

Table 32 shows the frequency of teacher and parent input scores by gender.

Table 32

Frequency of teacher and parent input scores by gender

	Teacher Input							
	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
Gender	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Females	0	0	10	13.2	28	36.8	38	50
Males	5	5.6	13	14.6	38	42.7	33	37.1

	Parent Input							
	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
Gender	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Females	0	0	3	4.2	22	30.6	47	65.3
Males	1	1.3	8	10.4	26	33.8	42	54.5

Table 33 shows the frequency of teacher and parent input scores by ethnic group.

Table 33

Frequency of teacher and parent input scores by ethnic group

	Teacher Input							
	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
Ethnicity	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Caucasian	2	1.5	18	13.3	57	42.2	58	43
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	6	50	6	50
Asian	1	11.1	3	33.3	3	33.3	2	22.2
African American	2	33.3	1	16.7	0	0	3	50
Other	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	2	66

	Parent Input							
	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	1	.8	10	8.2	36	29.5	75	61.5
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	6	50	6	50
Asian	0	0	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7
African American	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50
Other	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0

Table 34 shows the frequency of teacher and parent input scores by other exceptionality.

Table 34

Frequency of teacher and parent input scores by other exceptionality

	Teacher Input							
	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
Exceptionality Status	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No Exceptionality	5	3.3	14	9.2	64	42.1	69	45.4
Other Exceptionality	0	0	9	69.2	2	15.4	2	15.4

Parent Input

Exceptionality Status	No Recommendation n	%	Marginal Recommendation n	%	Recommendation n	%	Strong Recommendation n	%
No Exceptionality	1	.7	6	4.4	47	34.3	83	60.6
Other Exceptionality	0	0	5	41.7	1	8.3	6	50

Table 35 shows the frequency of teacher and parent input scores by age.

Table 35

Frequency of teacher and parent input scores by age

Teacher Input

Age	No Recommendation n	%	Marginal Recommendation n	%	Recommendation n	%	Strong Recommendation n	%
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
6	0	0	2	18.2	5	45.5	4	36.4
7	0	0	8	23.5	10	29.4	16	47.1
8	2	5.7	5	14.3	16	45.7	12	34.3
9	0	0	6	13.3	16	35.6	23	51.1
10	2	8	1	4	12	48	10	40
11	0	0	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
12	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Parent Input

	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
Age	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7
7	0	0	1	3.2	8	25.8	22	71
8	1	3	3	9.1	9	27.3	20	60.6
9	0	0	3	7.5	16	40	21	52.5
10	0	0	2	10	5	25	13	65
11	0	0	1	12.5	4	50	3	37.5
12	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50

Table 36 shows the frequency of teacher and parent input scores by grade.

Table 36

Frequency of teacher and parent input scores by grade

Teacher Input

	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
Grade	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
K	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50
1	0	0	3	16.7	7	38.9	8	44.4
2	1	2.4	7	16.7	16	38.1	18	42.9
3	1	2.6	7	17.9	15	38.5	16	41
4	2	5.1	4	10.3	17	43.6	16	41
5	0	0	0	0	7	38.9	11	61.1
6	0	0	1	20	3	60	1	20
7	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
8	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Parent Input

	No Recommendation		Marginal Recommendation		Recommendation		Strong Recommendation	
Grade	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
K	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
1	0	0	2	11.8	4	23.5	11	64.7
2	0	0	1	2.6	10	25.6	28	71.8
3	0	0	3	9.1	9	27.3	21	63.6
4	1	2.8	3	8.3	16	44.4	16	44.4
5	0	0	1	6.2	6	37.5	9	56.2
6	0	0	1	25	2	50	1	25
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
8	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50

Question 4: What criteria were used to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these criteria vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children? (See Chapter 5).

Question 5: What are the relationships among the various assessment components?

Table 37 shows correlations among scores on assessment measures.

Table 37

Correlations among scores on assessment measures

		WISC-IV/SB5 Composites*					
		VCI	PRI	FSIQ	WMI	PSI	GAI
VCI	r	---	.341**	.699**	.245**	.109	.803**
	sig	---	.000	.000	.001	.170	.000
	n	---	168	168	167	160	160
PRI	r	.341**	---	.772**	.406**	.139	.819**
	sig	.000	---	.000	.000	.080	.000
	n	168	---	168	167	160	160
FSIQ	r	.699**	.772**	---	.604**	.479**	.890**
	sig	.000	000	---	.000	.000	.000
	n	168	168	---	167	160	160
WM	r	.245**	.406**	.604**	---	112	.390**
	sig	.001	.000	.000	---	.158	.000
	n	167	167	167	---	160	160
PS	r	.109	.139	.479**	.112	---	.158*
	sig	.170	.080	.000	.158	---	.046
	n	160	160	160	160	---	160
GAI	r	.803**	.819**	.890**	.390**	.158*	---
	sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.046	---
	n	160	160	160	160	160	---

		WIAT-II Subtests					
		WR	RC	NO	MR	SP	WE
WR	r	---	.165	.155*	.307	.590**	.665
	sig	---	.724	.047	.504	.000	.335
	n	---	7	165	7	164	4
RC	r	.165	---	.005	.107	-.127	.792
	sig	.724	---	.992	.840	.810	.208
	n	7	---	7	6	6	4
NO	r	.155*	.005	---	.408	.293**	.665
	sig	.047	.992	---	.364	.000	.335
	n	165	7	---	7	164	4
MR	r	.307	.107	.408	---	.538	.482
	sig	.504	.840	.364	---	.271	.680
	n	7	6	7	---	6	3
SP	r	.590**	-.127	.293**	.538	---	.801
	sig	.000	.810	.000	.271	---	.199
	n	164	6	164	6	---	4
WE	r	.665	-.792	.665	-.482	.801	---
	sig	.335	.208	.335	.680	.199	---
	n	4	4	4	3	4	---

		WIAT-II Subtests					
		WR	RC	NO	MR	SP	WE
WISC-IV/SB5 Composites*							
VCI	r	.258**	.667	.270**	.032	.092	-.667
	sig	.001	.102	.000	.946	.242	.333
	n	165	7	165	7	164	4
PRI	r	.365**	-.228	.302**	.596	.224**	.138
	sig	.000	.622	.000	.157	.004	.862
	n	165	7	165	7	164	4

FSIQ	r	.442**	-.131	.430**	.581	.292**	.782
	sig	.000	.780	.000	.171	.000	.218
	n	165	7	165	7	164	4
WM	r	.394**	-.195	.263**	.516	.301**	.743
	sig	.000	.674	.001	.236	.000	.257
	n	165	7	165	7	164	4
PS	r	.137	-.310	.321**	.519	.221**	.848
	sig	.087	.498	.000	.232	.005	.152
	n	158	7	158	7	157	4
GAI	r	.372**	.154	.359**	.484	.171*	-.418
	sig	.000	.742	.000	.271	.032	.582
	n	158	7	158	7	157	4

WISC-IV/SB5 Composites*

		Teacher Input	Parent Input
VCI	r	.297**	.032
	sig	.000	.697
	n	165	149
PRI	r	.349**	.157
	sig	.000	.055
	n	165	149
FSIQ	r	.420**	.122
	sig	.000	.137
	n	165	149
WM	r	.136	.025
	sig	.083	.761
	n	164	149
PS	r	.225**	.090
	sig	.005	.288
	n	157	143
GAI	r	.385**	.111
	sig	.000	.186
	n	157	143

WR	r	.270**	.248**
	sig	.001	.002
	n	162	148
RC	r	.341	.490
	sig	.454	.323
	n	7	6
NO	r	.269**	.027
	sig	.001	.743
	n	162	148
MR	r	.829*	.476
	sig	.021	.340
	n	7	6
SP	r	.261**	.160
	sig	.001	.053
	n	161	147
WE	r	-.385	-.945
	sig	.615	.212
	n	4	3

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 38 shows the relationship between Verbal IQ and Nonverbal IQ scores by level.

Table 38

Relationship between Verbal IQ and Nonverbal IQ scores by level

	WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*				
≤119	38	12	11	8
120-124	10	4	5	9

125-129	7	6	7	6
≥130	18	6	6	15

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 39 shows the relationship between Verbal IQ and Working Memory scores by level.

Table 39

Relationship between Verbal IQ and Working Memory scores by level

	WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*				
≤119	48	11	7	3
120-124	17	3	2	5
125-129	14	9	1	2
≥130	24	9	10	2

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 40 shows the relationship between Verbal IQ and Processing Speed scores by level.

Table 40

Relationship between Verbal IQ and Processing Speed scores by level

	WISC-IV Processing Speed			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*				
≤119	46	12	2	5
120-124	20	4	0	1
125-129	19	2	4	0
≥130	32	5	3	5

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously

Table 41 shows the relationship between Nonverbal IQ and Working Memory scores by level.

Table 41

Relationship between Nonverbal IQ and Working Memory scores by level

	WISC-IV/SB5 Working Memory*			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*				
≤119	54	12	5	2
120-124	21	3	2	2
125-129	14	6	4	5

≥130	14	11	9	3

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 42 shows the relationship between Nonverbal IQ and Processing Speed scores by level.

Table 42

Relationship between Nonverbal IQ and Processing Speed scores by level

	WISC-IV Processing Speed			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*				
≤119	53	10	4	4
120-124	22	2	2	1
125-129	20	3	2	3
≥130	22	8	1	3

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 43 shows the relationship between FSIQ and GAI scores by level.

Table 43

Relationship between FSIQ and GAI scores by level

	WISC-IV GAI			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*				
≤119	39	10	1	0
120-124	6	12	8	5
125-129	1	5	15	16
≥130	0	4	5	33

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 44 shows the relationship between FSIQ and WIAT-II Word Reading scores by level.

Table 44

Relationship between FSIQ and WIAT-II Word Reading scores by level

	WIAT-II Word Reading			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*				
≤119	44	6	3	0
120-124	16	6	6	4

125-129	21	8	5	3
≥130	16	4	12	11

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 45 shows the relationship between FSIQ and Numerical Operations scores by level.

Table 45

Relationship between FSIQ and Numerical Operations scores by level

	WIAT-II Numerical Operations			
	≤119	120-124	125-129	≥130
WISC-IV/SB5 Full Scale*				
≤119	41	2	4	6
120-124	8	4	7	13
125-129	21	6	6	4
≥130	14	9	6	14

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Question 6: What assessment components and/or demographic variables had the greatest influence on eligibility decisions? Did these components vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Table 46 shows gifted program decision by referral source.

Table 46

Gifted program decision by referral source

Gifted Program Decision							
Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
Yes		No		Yes		No	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
52	69.3	23	30.7	59	63.4	34	36.6

Table 47 shows gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist.

Table 47

Gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist

	Gifted Program Decision			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
School Psychologist				
1	35	67.3	17	32.7
2	0	0	1	100

3	5	83.3	1	16.7
4	3	75	1	25
5	6	66.7	3	33.3
6	2	100	0	0
7	5	83.3	1	16.7
8	30	50	30	50
9	21	87.5	3	12.5
10	1	100	0	0
11	2	100	0	0

Table 48 shows gifted program decision by building.

Table 48

Gifted program decision by building

	Gifted Program Decision			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
School Building				
1	23	65.7	12	34.3
2	1	50	1	50
3	22	62.9	13	37.1
4	13	59.1	9	40.9
5	11	55	9	45
6	15	68.2	7	31.8
7	12	100	0	0
8	0	0	1	100
9	8	72.7	3	27.3
10	0	0	1	100

Table 49 shows gifted program decision by gender of referred children.

Table 49

Gifted program decision by gender of referred children

	Female				Male			
	Gifted Program Decision							
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	53	67.9	25	32.1	58	64.4	32	35.6

Table 50 shows gifted program decision by ethnic background of referred children.

Table 50

Gifted program decision by ethnic background of referred children

	Gifted Program Decision			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity				
Caucasian	91	65.9	47	34.1
Hispanic	9	75	3	25
Asian	5	55.6	4	44.4
African American	4	66.7	2	33.3
Other	2	66.7	1	33.3

Table 51 shows gifted program decision by other exceptionality of referred children.

Table 51

Gifted program decision by other exceptionality of referred children

	Gifted Program Decision			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Other Exceptionality				
No	98	63.2	57	36.8
Yes	13	100	0	0

Table 52 shows program decision by age of referred children.

Table 52

Gifted program decision by age of referred children

	Gifted Program Decision			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Age				
5	1	100	0	0
6	10	90.9	1	9.1
7	23	67.6	11	32.4
8	20	55.6	16	44.4
9	32	71.1	13	28.9
10	15	60	10	40
11	8	80	2	20
12	1	33.3	2	66.7
14	1	50	1	50

Table 53 shows gifted program decision by grade of referred children.

Table 53

Gifted program decision by grade of referred children

	Gifted Program Decision			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Grade				
K	1	50	1	50
1	15	83.3	3	16.7
2	27	62.8	16	37.2
3	24	61.5	15	38.5
4	26	66.7	13	33.3
5	14	73.7	5	26.3
6	3	60	2	40
7	0	0	1	100
8	1	50	1	50

Table 54 shows gifted program decision by referral source by evaluating school psychologist.

Table 54

Gifted program decision by referral source by evaluating school psychologist

	Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	21	61.8	13	38.2	14	77.8	4	22.2
2	0	0	1	100.0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	5	83.3	1	16.7
4	1	100.0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
5	2	100.0	0	0	4	57.1	3	42.9
6	0	0	0	0	2	100.0	0	0

7	2	100.0	0	0	3	75.0	1	25.0
8	20	71.4	8	28.6	10	31.3	22	68.8
9	5	83.3	1	16.7	16	88.9	2	11.1
10	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	2	100.0	0	0

Table 55 shows gifted program decision by referral source by building.

Table 55

Gifted program decision by referral source by building

	Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Building								
1	13	61.9	8	38.1	10	71.4	4	28.6
2	0	0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0
3	10	71.4	4	28.6	12	57.1	9	42.9
4	8	88.9	1	11.1	5	38.5	8	61.5
5	7	70.0	3	30.0	4	40.0	6	60.0
6	9	69.2	4	30.8	6	66.7	3	33.3
7	3	100.0	0	0	9	100.0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0
9	2	66.7	1	33.3	6	75.0	2	25.0
10	0	0	1	100.0	0	0	0	0

Table 56 shows gifted program decision by referral source by gender of referred children.

Table 56

Gifted program decision by referral source by gender of referred children

	Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender								
Female	24	68.6	11	31.4	29	67.4	14	32.6
Male	28	70	12	30	30	60	20	40

Table 57 shows gifted program decision by referral source by ethnic background of referred children.

Table 57

Gifted program decision by referral source by ethnic background of referred children

	Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	43	67.2	21	32.8	48	64.9	26	35.1
Hispanic	5	83.3	1	16.7	4	66.7	2	33.3
Asian	1	50	1	50	4	57.1	3	42.9
African American	3	100	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7
Other	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3

Table 58 shows gifted program decision by referral source by other exceptionality of referred children.

Table 58

Gifted program decision by referral source by other exceptionality of referred children

	Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Other Excep.								
No	48	67.6	23	32.4	50	59.5	34	40.5
Yes	4	100	0	0	9	100	0	0

Table 59 shows gifted program decision by referral source by age of referred children.

Table 59

Gifted program decision by referral source by age of referred children

	Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age								
5	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
6	2	100	0	0	8	88.9	1	11.1
7	14	82.4	3	17.6	9	52.9	8	47.1
8	8	57.1	6	42.9	12	54.5	10	45.5
9	18	78.3	5	21.7	14	63.6	8	36.4
10	4	50	4	50	11	64.7	6	35.3
11	6	75	2	25	2	100	0	0
12	0	0	2	100	1	100	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50

Table 60 shows gifted program decision by referral source by grade of referred children.

Table 60

Gifted program decision by referral source by grade of referred children

	Referral Source: Teacher				Referral Source: Parent			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade								
K	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
1	5	83.3	1	16.7	10	83.3	2	16.7
2	14	70	6	30	13	56.5	10	43.5
3	12	80	3	20	12	50	12	50
4	12	66.7	6	33.3	14	66.7	7	33.3
5	6	60	4	40	8	88.9	1	11.1
6	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50

Table 61 shows gifted program decision by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 61

Gifted program decision by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤119	6	11.3	47	88.7	5	10.9	41	89.1
120-124	22	68.8	10	31.3	20	64.5	11	35.5
125-129	39	100	0	0	26	89.7	3	10.3
≥130	44	100	0	0	54	100	0	0

	WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤119	23	33.3	46	66.7	30	41.1	43	58.9
120-124	22	78.6	6	21.4	18	64.3	10	35.7
125-129	23	88.5	3	11.5	25	86.2	4	13.8
≤130	43	95.6	2	4.4	38	100	0	0

	WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				WISC-IV/SB-V PS*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤119	57	55.3	46	44.7	67	57.3	50	42.7
120-124	26	81.3	6	18.8	21	91.3	2	8.7
125-129	16	80	4	20	8	88.9	1	11.1
≥ 130	11	91.7	1	8.3	9	81.8	2	18.2

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 62 shows gifted program decision by achievement test score levels.

Table 62

Gifted program decision by achievement test score levels

	WIAT-II WR				WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	54	55.7	43	44.3	44	52.4	40	47.6
120-124	16	66.7	8	33.3	18	85.7	3	14.3
125-129	22	84.6	4	15.4	18	78.3	5	21.7
≥ 130	16	88.9	2	11.1	28	75.7	9	24.3

Table 63 shows gifted program decision by teacher and parent input ratings.

Table 63

Gifted program decision by teacher and parent input ratings

	Teacher Input Rating				Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	5	100	1	100	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	11	47.8	12	52.2	6	54.5	5	45.5
Recommendation	33	50	33	50	27	56.3	21	43.8
Strong Recommendation	64	90.1	7	9.9	66	74.2	23	25.8

Table 64 shows gifted program decision by referral source by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 64

Gifted program decision by referral source by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	Teacher Referral WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Parent Referral WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	9.1	20	90.9	4	12.9	27	87.1
120-124	10	76.9	3	23.1	12	63.2	7	36.8
125-129	17	100	0	0	22	100	0	0
≥ 130	23	100	0	0	21	100	0	0

	Teacher Referral WISC-IV GAI				Parent Referral WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	14.3	18	85.7	2	8	23	92
120-124	7	63.6	4	36.4	13	65	7	35
125-129	12	100	0	0	14	82.4	3	17.6
≥ 130	28	100	0	0	26	100	0	0

	Teacher Referral WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				Parent Referral WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	11	36.7	19	63.3	12	30.8	27	69.2
120-124	9	75.0	3	25.0	13	81.3	3	18.8
125-129	13	92.9	1	7.1	10	83.3	2	16.7
≥ 130	19	100.0	0	0	24	92.3	2	7.7

	Teacher Referral WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				Parent Referral WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	9	33.3	18	66.7	21	45.7	25	54.3
120-124	9	69.2	4	30.8	9	60	6	40
125-129	14	93.3	1	6.7	11	78.6	3	21.4
≥ 130	20	100	0	0	18	100	0	0

	Teacher Referral WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				Parent Referral WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	30	61.2	19	38.8	27	50	27	50
120-124	10	71.4	4	28.6	16	88.9	2	11.1
125-129	7	100	0	0	9	69.2	4	30.8
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3

	Teacher Referral WISC-IV PS				Parent Referral WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	32	61.5	20	38.5	35	53.8	30	46.2
120-124	11	84.6	2	15.4	10	100	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	5	83.3	1	16.7
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	5	71.4	2	28.6

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 65 shows gifted program decision by referral source by achievement test score levels.

Table 65

Gifted program decision by referral source by achievement test score levels

	Teacher Referral WIAT-II WR				Parent Referral WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	26	57.8	19	42.2	28	53.8	24	46.2
120-124	10	83.3	2	16.7	6	50	6	50
125-129	10	83.3	2	16.7	12	85.7	2	14.3
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	11	84.6	2	15.4
	Teacher Referral WIAT-II NO				Parent Referral WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	18	52.9	16	47.1	26	52	24	48
120-124	11	100	0	0	7	70	3	30
125-129	8	80	2	20	10	76.9	3	23.1
≥ 130	14	73.7	5	26.3	14	77.8	4	22.2

Table 66 shows gifted program decision by referral source by teacher and parent input ratings.

Table 66

Gifted program decision by referral source by teacher and parent input ratings

	Teacher Referral Teacher Input Rating				Parent Referral Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100
Marginal Recommendation	3	60	2	40	8	44.4	10	55.6
Recommendation	14	45.2	17	54.8	19	54.3	16	45.7
Strong Recommendation	35	89.7	4	10.3	29	90.6	3	9.4

	Teacher Referral Parent Input Rating				Parent Referral Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	33.3	4	66.7	4	80	1	20
Recommendation	16	59.3	11	40.7	11	52.4	10	47.6
Strong Recommendation	26	81.3	6	18.8	40	70.2	17	29.8

Table 67 shows gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 67

Gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	School Psychologist 1 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				School Psychologist 2 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	16.7	15	83.3	0	0	1	100
120-124	5	71.4	2	28.6	0	0	0	0
125-129	13	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	14	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				School Psychologist 4 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	2	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	2	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				School Psychologist 6 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				School Psychologist 8 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	3	10.7	25	89.3
120-124	1	100	0	0	5	50	5	50
125-129	1	100	0	0	10	100	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	12	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 9 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				School Psychologist 10 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
120-124	9	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	6	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	6	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 1 WISC-IV GAI				School Psychologist 2 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	7.1	13	92.9	0	0	0	0
120-124	9	75	3	25	0	0	1	100
125-129	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	19	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 WISC-IV GAI				School Psychologist 4 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 WISC-IV GAI				School Psychologist 6 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WISC-IV GAI				School Psychologist 8 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	0	0	20	100
120-124	0	0	0	0	5	45.5	6	54.5
125-129	1	100	0	0	6	75	2	25
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	14	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 9 WISC-IV GAI				School Psychologist 10 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	50	3	50	0	0	0	0
120-124	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	8	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 1 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				School Psychologist 2 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	27.8	13	72.2	0	0	0	0
120-124	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0	1	100
125-129	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	14	93.3	1	6.7	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				School Psychologist 4 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	50	1	50	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				School Psychologist 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	33.3	2	66.7	1	100	0	0
120-124	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				School Psychologist 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	11	30.6	25	69.4
120-124	0	0	0	0	8	80	2	20
125-129	1	100	0	0	4	66.7	2	33.3
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	7	87.5	1	12.5

	School Psychologist 9 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				School Psychologist 10 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0	0	0
120-124	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	10	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 1 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				School Psychologist 2 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	8	38.1	13	61.9	0	0	1	100
120-124	8	66.7	4	33.3	0	0	0	0
125-129	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	12	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				School Psychologist 4 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	2	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				School Psychologist 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	25	3	75	1	100	0	0
120-124	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				School Psychologist 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	50	1	50	6	22.2	21	77.8
120-124	0	0	0	0	4	44.4	5	55.6
125-129	2	100	0	0	6	60	4	40
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	14	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 9 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				School Psychologist 10 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	10	76.9	3	23.1	0	0	0	0
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	6	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	1	100	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 1 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				School Psychologist 2 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	17	54.8	14	45.2	0	0	1	100
120-124	10	76.9	3	23.1	0	0	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				School Psychologist 4 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	1	100
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				School Psychologist 6 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	50	1	50	1	100	0	0
125-129	1	50	1	50	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				School Psychologist 8 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	66.7	1	33.3	19	42.2	26	57.8
120-124	1	100	0	0	4	66.7	2	33.3
125-129	1	100	0	0	4	80	1	20
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	3	75	1	25

	School Psychologist 9 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				School Psychologist 10 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	12	80	3	20	0	0	0	0
120-124	5	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	1	100	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 1 WISC-IV/SB-V PS				School Psychologist 2 WISC-IV/SB-V PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	27	62.8	16	37.2	0	0	1	100
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 WISC-IV/SB-V PS				School Psychologist 4 WISC-IV/SB-V PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	80	1	20	0	0	1	100
120-124	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 WISC-IV/SB-V PS				School Psychologist 6 WISC-IV/SB-V PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	50	3	50	1	100	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WISC-IV/SB-V PS				School Psychologist 8 WISC-IV/SB-V PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	66.7	1	33.3	17	41.5	24	58.5
120-124	1	100	0	0	7	87.5	1	12.5
125-129	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	100

	School Psychologist 9 WISC-IV/SB-V PS				School Psychologist 10 WISC-IV/SB-V PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	11	78.6	3	21.4	0	0	0	0
120-124	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WISC-IV/SB-V PS			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	1	100	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

---

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 68 shows gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist by achievement test score levels.

Table 68

Gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist by achievement test score levels

	School Psychologist 1 WIAT-II WR				School Psychologist 2 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	18	58.1	13	41.9	0	0	1	100
120-124	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0
125-129	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 WIAT-II WR				School Psychologist 4 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 WIAT-II WR				School Psychologist 6 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	80	1	20	1	100	0	0
120-124	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WIAT-II WR				School Psychologist 8 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	100	0	0	16	40	24	60
120-124	0	0	1	100	6	66.7	3	33.3
125-129	1	100	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7

	School Psychologist 9 WIAT-II WR				School Psychologist 10 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	9	81.8	2	18.2	1	100	0	0
120-124	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
125-129	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 1 WIAT-II NO				School Psychologist 2 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	18	58.1	13	41.9	0	0	0	0
120-124	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	8	66.7	4	33.3	0	0	1	100

	School Psychologist 3 WIAT-II NO				School Psychologist 4 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	1	50	1	50

	School Psychologist 5 WIAT-II NO				School Psychologist 6 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 WIAT-II NO				School Psychologist 8 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	50	1	50	9	31	20	69
120-124	1	100	0	0	6	66.7	3	33.3
125-129	1	100	0	0	7	58.3	5	41.7
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	7	77.8	2	22.2

	School Psychologist 9 WIAT-II NO				School Psychologist 10 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	70	3	30	0	0	0	0
120-124	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	7	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

Table 69 shows gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist by teacher and by parent input ratings.

Table 69

Gifted program decision by evaluating school psychologist by teacher and by parent input ratings

	School Psychologist 1 Teacher Input Rating				School Psychologist 2 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	13	50	13	50	0	0	1	100
Strong Recommendation	17	85	3	15	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 Teacher Input Rating				School Psychologist 4 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100
Recommendation	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	2	100	0	0	2	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 Teacher Input Rating				School Psychologist 6 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
Recommendation	2	50	2	50	1	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 Teacher Input Rating				School Psychologist 8 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	2	18.2	9	81.8
Recommendation	2	100	0	0	7	31.8	15	68.2
Strong Recommendation	3	75	1	25	21	91.3	2	8.7

	School Psychologist 9 Teacher Input Rating				School Psychologist 10 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	15	93.8	1	6.3	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	1	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 1 Parent Input Rating				School Psychologist 2 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	40	3	60	0	0	1	100
Recommendation	8	50	8	50	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	21	77.8	6	22.2	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 3 Parent Input Rating				School Psychologist 4 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
Strong Recommendation	4	80	1	20	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 5 Parent Input Rating				School Psychologist 6 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	1	33.3	2	66.7	1	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	100	0	0

	School Psychologist 7 Parent Input Rating				School Psychologist 8 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
Recommendation	3	100	0	0	8	47.1	9	52.9
Strong Recommendation	1	50	1	50	18	58.1	13	41.9

	School Psychologist 9 Parent Input Rating				School Psychologist 10 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0	0	0

	School Psychologist 11 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	1	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	1	100	0	0

Table 70 shows gifted program decision by building by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 70

Gifted program decision by building by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	Building 1 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Building 2 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	14.3	12	85.7	1	50	1	50
120-124	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	9	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Building 4 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	16.7	10	83.3	0	0	5	100
120-124	4	57.1	3	42.9	2	33.3	4	66.7
125-129	8	100	0	0	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	8	100	0	0	8	100	0	0

	Building 5 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Building 6 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	9	100	0	0	6	100
120-124	3	100	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
125-129	4	100	0	0	6	100	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	7	100	0	0

	Building 7 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Building 8 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
120-124	4	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Building 10 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
120-124	3	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 1 WISC-IV GAI				Building 2 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	8.3	11	91.7	0	0	0	0
120-124	5	100	0	0	1	50	1	50
125-129	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	13	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 WISC-IV GAI				Building 4 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	11.1	8	88.9	1	20	4	80
120-124	6	66.7	3	33.3	0	0	3	100
125-129	4	100	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7
≥ 130	9	100	0	0	9	100	0	0

	Building 5 WISC-IV GAI				Building 6 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	8	100	0	0	5	100
120-124	2	66.7	1	33.3	2	50	2	50
125-129	5	100	0	0	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	9	100	0	0

	Building 7 WISC-IV GAI				Building 8 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 WISC-IV GAI				Building 10 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 1 WISC-IV/SB Verbal*				Building 2 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	8.3	11	91.7	0	0	0	0
120-124	4	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	10	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	8	88.9	1	11.1	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No		Building 4 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	41.2	10	58.8	2	22.2	7	77.8
120-124	7	77.8	2	22.2	3	100	0	0
125-129	1	50	1	50	3	60	2	40
≥ 130	7	100	0	0	5	100	0	0

	Building 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No		Building 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	36.4	7	63.6	3	33.3	6	66.7
120-124	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	50	1	50
125-129	2	100	0	0	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	3	75	1	25	7	100	0	0

	Building 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No		Building 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No		Building 10 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 1 WISC-IV/SB Nonverbal*				Building 2 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	6	37.5	10	62.5	1	50	1	50
120-124	7	77.8	2	22.2	0	0	0	0
125-129	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				Building 4 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	35.7	9	64.3	2	28.6	5	71.4
120-124	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0	1	100
125-129	7	87.5	1	12.5	2	40	3	60
≥ 130	6	100	0	0	9	100	0	0

	Building 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				Building 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	25	9	75	3	42.9	4	57.1
120-124	1	100	0	0	4	57.1	3	42.9
125-129	3	100	0	0	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	5	100	0	0

	Building 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				Building 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	6	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		No		Building 10 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	50	3	50	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 1 WISC-IV/SB-V WM* Yes		No		Building 2 WISC-IV/SB-V WM* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	12	54.5	10	45.5	1	50	1	50
120-124	7	77.8	2	22.2	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 WISC-IV/SB-V WM* Yes		No		Building 4 WISC-IV/SB-V WM* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	10	50	10	50	6	42.9	8	57.1
120-124	4	80	1	20	2	100	0	0
125-129	4	80	1	20	4	80	1	20
≥ 130	4	80	1	20	1	100	0	0

	Building 5 WISC-IV/SB-V WM* Yes		No		Building 6 WISC-IV/SB-V WM* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	6	46.2	7	53.8	10	66.7	5	33.3
120-124	2	50	2	50	4	80	1	20
125-129	1	100	0	0	1	50	1	50
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 7 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				Building 8 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				Building 10 WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	62.5	3	37.5	0	0	1	100
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 1 WISC-IV PS				Building 2 WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	18	62.1	11	37.9	1	50	1	50
120-124	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 WISC-IV PS				Building 4 WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	14	58.3	10	41.7	8	50	8	50
120-124	1	100	0	0	3	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
≥ 130	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0

	Building 5 WISC-IV PS				Building 6 WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	41.7	7	58.3	9	56.3	7	43.8
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	50	1	50	1	100	0	0

	Building 7 WISC-IV PS				Building 8 WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
120-124	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 WISC-IV PS				Building 10 WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0	1	100
120-124	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 71 shows gifted program decision by building by achievement test score levels.

Table 71

Gifted program decision by building by achievement test score levels

	Building 1 WIAT-II WR				Building 2 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	11	55	9	45	0	0	1	100
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	1	100	0	0
125-129	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 WIAT-II WR				Building 4 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	9	47.4	10	52.6	7	58.3	5	41.7
120-124	2	40	3	60	2	66.7	1	33.3
125-129	5	100	0	0	3	75	1	25
≥ 130	6	100	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7

	Building 5 WIAT-II WR				Building 6 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	33.3	8	66.7	9	56.3	7	43.8
120-124	3	75	1	25	1	100	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Building 7 WIAT-II WR				Building 8 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 WIAT-II WR				Building 10 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	50	1	50	0	0	1	100
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 1 WIAT-II NO				Building 2 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	13	56.5	10	43.5	1	100	0	0
120-124	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0	1	100

	Building 3 WIAT-II NO				Building 4 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	11	61.1	7	38.9	1	20	4	80
120-124	3	100	0	0	2	50	2	50
125-129	0	0	3	100	5	71.4	2	28.6
≥ 130	8	72.7	3	27.3	5	83.3	1	16.7

	Building 5 WIAT-II NO				Building 6 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	27.3	8	72.7	10	58.8	7	41.2
120-124	1	50	1	50	3	100	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Building 7 WIAT-II NO				Building 8 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	6	100	0	0	0	0	1	100

	Building 9 WIAT-II NO				Building 10 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0
120-124	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	1	100

Table 72 shows gifted program decision by building by teacher and by parent ratings.

Table 72

Gifted program decision by building by teacher and by parent input ratings

	Building 1 Teacher Input Rating				Building 2 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	100	0	0
Recommendation	10	50	10	50	0	0	1	100
Strong Recommendation	11	91.7	1	8.3	0	0	0	0

	Building 3 Teacher Input Rating				Building 4 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	3	42.9	4	57.1	0	0	3	100
Recommendation	5	45.5	6	54.5	3	42.9	4	57.1
Strong Recommendation	13	100	0	0	10	83.3	2	16.7

	Building 5 Teacher Input Rating				Building 6 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	50	1	50	4	57.1	3	42.9
Recommendation	5	41.7	7	58.3	3	60	2	40
Strong Recommendation	5	100	0	0	8	80	2	20

	Building 7 Teacher Input Rating				Building 8 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 Teacher Input Rating				Building 10 Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	1	100
Strong Recommendation	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0

	Building 1 Parent Input Rating				Building 2 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	1	100
Recommendation	8	53.3	7	46.7	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	12	80	3	20	1	100	0	0

	Building 3 Parent Input Rating				Building 4 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	2	25	6	75	4	66.7	2	33.3
Strong Recommendation	17	85	3	15	7	53.8	6	46.2

	Building 5 Parent Input Rating				Building 6 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	50	1	50	3	100	0	0
Recommendation	4	50	4	50	2	66.7	1	33.3
Strong Recommendation	4	80	1	20	9	60	6	40

	Building 7 Parent Input Rating				Building 8 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	4	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
Strong Recommendation	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Building 9 Parent Input Rating				Building 10 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	3	60	2	40	0	0	1	100

Table 73 shows gifted program decision by gender by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 73
Gifted program decision by gender by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	Female WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Female WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No		Male WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Male WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	8.3	22	91.7	4	13.8	25	86.2
120-124	8	72.7	3	27.3	14	66.7	7	33.3
125-129	20	100	0	0	19	100	0	0
≥ 130	23	100	0	0	21	100	0	0

	Female WISC-IV GAI Yes		Female WISC-IV GAI No		Male WISC-IV GAI Yes		Male WISC-IV GAI No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	4.8	20	95.2	4	16	21	84
120-124	11	68.8	5	31.3	9	60	6	40
125-129	15	100	0	0	11	78.6	3	21.4
≥ 130	23	100	0	0	31	100	0	0

	Female WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		Female WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* No		Male WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		Male WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	13	38.2	21	61.8	10	28.6	25	71.4
120-124	10	71.4	4	28.6	12	85.7	2	14.3
125-129	11	100	0	0	12	80	3	20
≥ 130	19	100	0	0	24	92.3	2	7.7

	Female WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				Male WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	14	43.8	18	56.3	16	39	25	61
120-124	10	62.5	6	37.5	8	66.7	4	33.3
125-129	15	93.8	1	6.3	10	76.9	3	23.1
≥ 130	14	100	0	0	24	100	0	0

	Female WISC-IV/SB-V WM*				Male WISC-IV/SB-V WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	26	57.8	19	42.2	31	53.4	27	46.6
120-124	13	81.3	3	18.8	13	81.3	3	18.8
125-129	3	50	3	50	13	92.9	1	7.1
≥ 130	10	100	0	0	1	50	1	50

	Female WISC-IV PS				Male WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	26	53.1	23	46.9	41	60.3	27	39.7
120-124	11	91.7	1	8.3	10	90.9	1	9.1
125-129	6	85.7	1	14.3	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	7	100	0	0	2	50	2	50

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 74 shows gifted program decision by gender by achievement test score levels.

Table 74

Gifted program decision by gender by achievement test score levels

	Female WIAT-II WR Yes		Female WIAT-II WR No		Male WIAT-II WR Yes		Male WIAT-II WR No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	22	50	22	50	32	60.4	21	39.6
120-124	8	88.9	1	11.1	8	53.3	7	46.7
125-129	11	91.7	1	8.3	11	78.6	3	21.4
≥ 130	10	90.9	1	9.1	6	85.7	1	14.3

	Female WIAT-II NO Yes		Female WIAT-II NO No		Male WIAT-II NO Yes		Male WIAT-II NO No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
≤ 119	26	56.5	20	43.5	18	47.4	20	52.6
120-124	8	100	0	0	10	76.9	3	23.1
125-129	5	71.4	2	28.6	13	81.3	3	18.8
≥ 130	12	80	3	20	16	72.7	6	27.3

Table 75 shows gifted program decision by gender by teacher and by parent input ratings.

Table 75

Gifted program decision by gender by teacher and by parent input ratings

	Female Teacher Input Rating				Male Teacher Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100
Marginal Recommendation	3	30	7	70	8	61.5	5	38.5
Recommendation	15	53.6	13	46.4	18	47.4	20	52.6
Strong Recommendation	33	86.8	5	13.2	31	93.9	2	6.1

	Female Parent Input Rating				Male Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	66.7	1	33.3	4	50	4	50
Recommendation	14	63.6	8	36.4	13	50	13	50
Strong Recommendation	35	74.5	12	25.5	31	73.8	11	26.2

Table 76 shows gifted program decision by ethnic group by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 76

Gifted program decision by ethnic group by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	Caucasian WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Caucasian WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No		Hispanic WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Hispanic WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	11.4	39	88.6	1	33.3		66.7
120-124	18	69.2	8	30.8	2	66.7	1	33.3
125-129	30	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	38	100	0	0	4	100	0	0

	Asian WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Asian WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No		African American WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		African American WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	3	100	0	0	2	100
120-124	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0.0	0	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0.0	0	1	100	0	0

	Other WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Other WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	Caucasian WISC-IV GAI				Hispanic WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	10.8	33	89.2	0	0	2	100
120-124	15	60	10	40	3	100	0	0
125-129	20	90.9	2	9.1	2	66.7	1	33.3
≥ 130	47	100	0	0	3	100	0	0

	Asian WISC-IV GAI				African American WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	25	3	75	0	0	2	100
120-124	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Other WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	Caucasian WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*				Hispanic WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	17	31.5	37	68.5	2	40	3	60
120-124	18	78.3	5	21.7	1	100	0	0
125-129	18	85.7	3	14.3	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	38	95	2	5	2	100	0	0

	Asian WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal* Yes		Asian WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal* No		African American WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal* Yes		African American WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	33.3	4	66.7	2	50	2	50
120-124	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Other WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal* Yes		Other WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal* No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	50	1	50
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Caucasian WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* Yes		Caucasian WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* No		Hispanic WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* Yes		Hispanic WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	25	40.3	37	59.7	2	66.7	1	33.3
120-124	15	65.2	8	34.8	2	66.7	1	33.3
125-129	17	89.5	2	10.5	3	75	1	25
≥ 130	34	100	0	0	2	100	0	0

	Asian WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* Yes		Asian WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* No		African American WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* Yes		African American WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	50	2	50	0	0	2	100
120-124	0	0	1	100	1	100	0	0
125-129	2	66.7	1	33.3	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Other WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	1	50	1	50
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	Caucasian WISC-IV/SB5 WM*				Hispanic WISC-IV/SB5 WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	47	56	37	44	5	62.5	3	37.5
120-124	20	80	5	20	2	100	0	0
125-129	15	78.9	4	21.1	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	8	88.9	1	11.1	2	100	0	0

	Asian WISC-IV/SB5 WM*				African American WISC-IV/SB5 WM*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	40	3	60	2	50	2	50
120-124	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	100	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Other WISC-IV/SB5 WM*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	1	50	1	50
120-124	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	WISC-IV PS				WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	60	59.4	41	40.6	1	25	3	75
120-124	14	87.5	2	12.5	5	100	0	0
125-129	5	83.3	1	16.7	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	7	87.5	1	12.5	1	100	0	0

	Asian WISC-IV PS				African American WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	42.9	4	57.1	2	66.7	1	33.3
120-124	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100

	Other WISC-IV PS			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	1	50	1	50
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 77 shows gifted program decision by ethnic group by achievement test score levels.

Table 77

Gifted program decision by ethnic group by achievement test score levels

	Caucasian WIAT-II WR				Hispanic WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	49	57.6	36	42.4	4	66.7	2	33.3
120-124	13	65	7	35	0	0	0	0
125-129	17	89.5	2	10.5	2	66.7	1	33.3
≥ 130	10	83.3	2	16.7	3	100	0	0

	Asian WIAT-II WR				African American WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	2	100
120-124	0	0	1	100	2	100	0	0
125-129	1	50	1	50	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Other WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Caucasian WIAT-II NO				Hispanic WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	35	51.5	33	48.5	3	75	1	25
120-124	16	88.9	2	11.1	1	100	0	0
125-129	15	78.9	4	21.1	1	50	1	50
≥ 130	23	74.2	8	25.8	4	80	1	20

	Asian WIAT-II NO				African American WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	40	3	60	3	60	2	40
120-124	0	0	1	100	1	100	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Other WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	1	50	1	50
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

Table 78 shows gifted program decision by ethnic group by teacher and by parent input ratings.

Table 78

Gifted program decision by ethnic group by teacher and by parent input ratings

	Caucasian Teacher Input Rating				Caucasian Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	2	100	1	100	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	10	55.6	8	44.4	6	60	4	40
Recommendation	27	47.4	30	52.6	18	50	18	50
Strong Recommendation	51	87.9	7	12.1	55	73.3	20	26.7

	Hispanic Teacher Input Rating				Hispanic Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	3	50	3	50	4	66.7	2	33.3
Strong Recommendation	6	100	0	0	5	83.3	1	16.7

	Asian Teacher Input Rating				Asian Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	3	100	0	0	1	100
Recommendation	3	100	0	0	1	50	1	50
Strong Recommendation	2	100	0	0	4	66.7	2	33.3

	African American Teacher Input Rating				African American Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	3	100	0	0	2	100	0	0

	Other Teacher Input Rating				Other Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 79 shows gifted program decision by other exceptionality by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 79

Gifted program decision by other exceptionality by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	No Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 FSIQ*				Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	6	47	94	3	100	0	0
120-124	21	67.7	10	32.3	1	100	0	0
125-129	34	100	0	0	5	100	0	0
≥ 130	40	100	0	0	4	100	0	0

	No Other Exceptionality WISC-IV GAI				Other Exceptionality WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	10.9	41	89.1	0	0	0	0
120-124	15	57.7	11	42.3	5	100	0	0
125-129	23	88.5	3	11.5	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	49	100	0	0	5	100	0	0

	No Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*				Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	21	31.3	46	68.7	2	100	0	0
120-124	21	77.8	6	22.2	1	100	0	0
125-129	19	86.4	3	13.6	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	37	94.9	2	5.1	6	100	0	0

	No Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*				Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	25	36.8	43	63.2	5	100	0	0
120-124	15	60	10	40	3	100	0	0
125-129	24	85.7	4	14.3	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	34	100	0	0	4	100	0	0

	No Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 WMI*				Other Exceptionality WISC-IV/SB5 WMI*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	49	51.6	46	48.4	8	100	0	0
120-124	21	77.8	6	22.2	5	100	0	0
125-129	16	80	4	20	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	11	91.7	1	8.3	0	0	0	0

	No Other Exceptionality WISC-IV PSI				Other Exceptionality WISC-IV PSI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	55	52.4	50	47.6	12	100	0	0
120-124	21	91.3	2	8.7	0	0	0	0
125-129	8	88.9	1	11.1	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	8	80	2	20	1	100	0	0

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 80 shows gifted program decision by other exceptionality by achievement test score levels.

Table 80

Gifted program decision by other exceptionality by achievement test score levels

	No Other Exceptionality WIAT-II WR				Other Exceptionality WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	45	51.1	43	48.9	9	100	0	0
120-124	14	63.6	8	36.4	2	100	0	0
125-129	20	83.3	4	16.7	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	16	88.9	2	11.1	0	0	0	0

	No Other Exceptionality WIAT-II NO				Other Exceptionality WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	33	45.2	40	54.8	11	100	0	0
120-124	17	85	3	15	1	100	0	0
125-129	17	77.3	5	22.7	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	28	75.7	9	24.3	0	0	0	0

Table 81 shows gifted program decision by other exceptionality by teacher and by parent input ratings.

Table 81

Gifted program decision by other exceptionality by teacher and by parent input ratings

	No Other Exceptionality Teacher Input Rating				No Other Exceptionality Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	5	100	1	100	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	14.3	12	85.7	1	16.7	5	83.3
Recommendation	31	48.4	33	51.6	26	55.3	21	44.7
Strong Recommendation	62	89.9	7	10.1	60	72.3	23	27.7
	Other Exceptionality Teacher Input Rating				Other Exceptionality Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	9	100	0	0	5	100	0	0
Recommendation	2	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	2	100	0	0	6	100	0	0

Table 82 shows gifted program decision by age of referred child by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 82

Gifted program decision by age of referred child by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	Age 5 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Age 6 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
Score Range	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	8	100	0	0

	Age 7 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Age 8 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	9.1	10	90.9	0	0	15	100
120-124	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	75	1	25
125-129	7	100	0	0	8	100	0	0
≥ 130	13	100	0	0	9	100	0	0

	Age 9 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Age 10 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	15.4	11	84.6	2	22.2	7	77.8
120-124	9	81.8	2	18.2	5	62.5	3	37.5
125-129	15	100	0	0	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	6	100	0	0	4	100	0	0

	Age 11 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Age 11 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No		Age 12 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Age 12 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	1	100
120-124	2	100	0	0	1	50	1	50
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Age 14 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Age 14 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	1	100
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Age 5 WISC-IV GAI Yes		Age 5 WISC-IV GAI No		Age 6 WISC-IV GAI Yes		Age 6 WISC-IV GAI No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	8	100	0	0

	Age 7 WISC-IV GAI Yes		Age 7 WISC-IV GAI No		Age 8 WISC-IV GAI Yes		Age 8 WISC-IV GAI No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	10	9	90	0	0	14	100
120-124	4	66.7	2	33.3	1	50	1	50
125-129	7	100	0	0	4	80	1	20
≥ 130	10	100	0	0	15	100	0	0

	Age 9 WISC-IV GAI				Age 10 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	23.1	10	76.9	1	20	4	80
120-124	8	72.7	3	27.3	4	57.1	3	42.9
125-129	8	100	0	0	4	80	1	20
≥ 130	10	100	0	0	5	100	0	0

	Age 11 WISC-IV GAI				Age 12 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100
120-124	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	1	100
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Age 14 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Age 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				Age 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	41.2	10	58.8	4	100	0	0
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	2	100	0	0
125-129	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	4	100	0	0

	Age 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No		Age 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	41.2	10	58.8	1	6.3	15	93.8
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	4	100	0	0
125-129	6	100	0	0	5	100	0	0
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	10	90.9	1	9.1

	Age 9 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No		Age 10 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	43.8	9	56.3	3	30	7	70
120-124	7	77.8	2	22.2	2	50	2	50
125-129	7	77.8	2	22.2	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	11	100	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3

	Age 11 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No		Age 12 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	1	100
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Age 14 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Age 5				Age 6			
	WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	9	100	0	0

	Age 7				Age 8			
	WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	14.3	6	85.7	4	22.2	14	77.8
120-124	7	70	3	30	3	60	2	40
125-129	6	75	2	25	8	100	0	0
≥ 130	9	100	0	0	5	100	0	0

	Age 9				Age 10			
	WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	14	56	11	44	7	46.7	8	53.3
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	2	66.7	1	33.3
125-129	6	85.7	1	14.3	2	66.7	1	33.3
≥ 130	7	100	0	0	4	100	0	0

	Age 11				Age 12			
	WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*				WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	75	1	25	1	50	1	50
120-124	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Age 14

	WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

Age 5 / Age 6

	Age 5 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI*				Age 6 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	3	75	1	25
120-124	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

Age 7 / Age 8

	Age 7 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI*				Age 8 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	53.8	6	46.2	11	44	14	56
120-124	7	70	3	30	5	71.4	2	28.6
125-129	3	60	2	40	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	6	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

Age 9 / Age 10

	Age 9 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI*				Age 10 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	20	64.5	11	35.5	11	55	9	45
120-124	7	87.5	1	12.5	2	100	0	0
125-129	3	75	1	25	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	1	50	1	50

	Age 11 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		Age 11 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* No		Age 12 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		Age 12 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	66.7	2	33.3	1	33.3	2	66.7
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Age 14 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		Age 14 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	1	100
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	Age 5 WISC-IV PSI Yes		Age 5 WISC-IV PSI No		Age 6 WISC-IV PSI Yes		Age 6 WISC-IV PSI No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3
120-124	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Age 7 WISC-IV PSI Yes		Age 7 WISC-IV PSI No		Age 8 WISC-IV PSI Yes		Age 8 WISC-IV PSI No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	13	59.1	9	40.9	16	53.3	14	46.7
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
≥ 130	2	66.7	1	33.3	2	66.7	1	33.3

	Age 9 WISC-IV PSI				Age 10 WISC-IV PSI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	18	60	12	40	9	52.9	8	47.1
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	4	100	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Age 11 WISC-IV PSI				Age 12 WISC-IV PSI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	66.7	2	33.3	1	33.3	2	66.7
120-124	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Age 14 WISC-IV PSI			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

*These tables include 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 83 shows gifted program decision by age of referred child by achievement test score levels.

Table 83

Gifted program decision by age of referred child by achievement test score levels

	Age 5 WIAT-II WR				Age 6 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	7	87.5	1	12.5
	Age 7 WIAT-II WR				Age 8 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	45.5	6	54.5	11	45.8	13	54.2
120-124	6	75	2	25	2	50	2	50
125-129	8	80	2	20	4	80	1	20
≥ 130	4	80	1	20	3	100	0	0
	Age 9 WIAT-II WR				Age 10 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	18	64.3	10	35.7	13	56.5	10	43.5
120-124	7	70	3	30	0	0	0	0
125-129	4	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Age 11 WIAT-II WR				Age 12 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	6	75	2	25	0	0	1	100
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Age 14 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	50	1	50
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	Age 5 WIAT-II NO				Age 6 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3
120-124	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0

	Age 7 WIAT-II NO				Age 8 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	12	57.1	9	42.9	10	41.7	14	58.3
120-124	4	80	1	20	4	100	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	3	60	2	40
≥ 130	4	80	1	20	3	100	0	0

	Age 9 WIAT-II NO				Age 10 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	11	61.1	7	38.9	3	37.5	5	62.5
120-124	5	71.4	2	28.6	1	100	0	0
125-129	6	85.7	1	14.3	3	60	2	40
≥ 130	9	75	3	25	7	70	3	30

	Age 11 WIAT-II NO				Age 12 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	50	2	50	0	0	1	100
120-124	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	1	50	1	50

	Age 14 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	1	100

Table 84 shows gifted program decision by age of referred child by teacher and by parent input ratings.

Table 84

Gifted program decision by age of referred child by teacher and by parent input ratings

	Age 5 Teacher Input Rating				Age 5 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Age 6 Teacher Input Rating				Age 6 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	50	1	50	1	100	0	0
Recommendation	5	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	4	100	0	0	7	87.5	1	12.5

	Age 7 Teacher Input Rating				Age 7 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	4	50	4	50	1	100	0	0
Recommendation	5	50	5	50	6	75	2	25
Strong Recommendation	14	87.5	2	12.5	15	68.2	7	31.8

	Age 8 Teacher Input Rating				Age 8 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	2	100	1	100	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	40	3	60	1	33.3	2	66.7
Recommendation	6	37.5	10	62.5	5	55.6	4	44.4
Strong Recommendation	11	91.7	1	8.3	11	55	9	45

	Age 9 Teacher Input Rating				Age 9 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	33.3	4	66.7	1	33.3	2	66.7
Recommendation	8	50	8	50	8	50	8	50
Strong Recommendation	22	95.7	1	4.3	19	90.5	2	9.5

	Age 10 Teacher Input Rating				Age 10 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	100	0	0	1	50	1	50
Recommendation	5	41.7	7	58.3	1	20	4	80
Strong Recommendation	9	90	1	10	11	84.6	2	15.4

	Age 11 Teacher Input Rating				Age 11 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
Recommendation	3	100	0	0	4	100	0	0
Strong Recommendation	3	60	2	40	2	66.7	1	33.3

	Age 12 Teacher Input Rating				Age 12 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	1	33.3	2	66.7	1	50	1	50
Strong Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

	Age 14 Teacher Input Rating Yes		Age 14 Teacher Input Rating No		Age 14 Parent Input Rating Yes		Age 14 Parent Input Rating No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Strong Recommendation	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

Table 85 shows gifted program decision by grade of referred child by intellectual assessment composite score levels.

Table 85

Gifted program decision by grade of referred child by intellectual assessment composite score levels

	Kindergarten WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Kindergarten WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No		Grade 1 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* Yes		Grade 1 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
120-124	0	0	1	100	1	100	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	11	100	0	0

	Grade 2 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Grade 3 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	6.7	14	93.3	2	11.8	15	88.2
120-124	2	50	2	50	3	100	0	0
125-129	10	100	0	0	13	100	0	0
≥ 130	14	100	0	0	6	100	0	0

	Grade 4 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Grade 5 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	10	9	90	1	20	4	80
120-124	10	71.4	4	28.6	5	83.3	1	16.7
125-129	9	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	6	100	0	0	6	100	0	0

	Grade 6 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*				Grade 7 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Grade 8 WISC-IV/SB-V FSIQ*			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	1	100
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Kindergarten WISC-IV GAI				Grade 1 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
120-124	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
125-129	0	0	1	100	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	11	100	0	0

	Grade 2 WISC-IV GAI				Grade 3 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	6.3	15	93.8	0	0	12	100
120-124	3	75.0	1	25	6	75	2	25
125-129	7	100	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3
≥ 130	15	100	0	0	11	100	0	0

	Grade 4 WISC-IV GAI				Grade 5 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	4	33.3	8	66.7	0	0	1	100
120-124	4	66.7	2	33.3	4	50	4	50
125-129	8	88.9	1	11.1	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	8	100	0	0	6	100	0	0

	Grade 6 WISC-IV GAI				Grade 7 WISC-IV GAI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Grade 8
WISC-IV GAI

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Kindergarten WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				Grade 1 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	6	75	2	25
120-124	1	100	0	0	3	75	1	25
125-129	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	6	100	0	0

	Grade 2 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				Grade 3 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	23.8	16	76.2	3	21.4	11	78.6
120-124	8	100	0	0	3	60	2	40
125-129	9	100	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3
≥ 130	5	100	0	0	12	92.3	1	7.7

	Grade 4 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*				Grade 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal*			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	7	36.8	12	63.2	2	50	2	50
120-124	6	100	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7
125-129	5	83.3	1	16.7	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	8	100	0	0	9	90	1	10

	Grade 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		Grade 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* No		Grade 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		Grade 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Grade 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* Yes		Grade 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Verbal* No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0

	Kindergarten WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Kindergarten WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No		Grade 1 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 1 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
120-124	0	0	1	100	2	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	1	100	0	0	10	100	0	0

	Grade 2 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 2 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No		Grade 3 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 3 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	8.3	11	91.7	10	43.5	13	56.5
120-124	5	62.5	3	37.5	5	71.4	2	28.6
125-129	10	83.3	2	16.7	5	100.0	0	0
≥ 130	11	100	0	0	4	100	0	0

	Grade 4 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 4 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No		Grade 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 5 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	10	52.6	9	47.4	8	66.7	4	33.3
120-124	5	71.4	2	28.6	0	0	1	100
125-129	4	66.7	2	33.3	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	7	100	0	0	5	100	0	0

	Grade 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 6 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No		Grade 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 7 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Grade 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* Yes		Grade 8 WISC-IV/SB-V Nonverbal* No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	Kindergarten WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No		Grade 1 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	6	75	2	25
120-124	0	0	0	0	4	80	1	20
125-129	0	0	0	0	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

	Grade 2 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No		Grade 3 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	9	47.4	10	52.6	14	48.3	15	51.7
120-124	8	66.7	4	33.3	6	100	2	28.6
125-129	3	60	2	40	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	7	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Grade 4 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No		Grade 5 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	18	64.3	10	35.7	8	61.5	5	38.5
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	2	100	0	0
125-129	1	50	1	50	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	100	0	0

	Grade 6 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No		Grade 7 WISC-IV/SB-V WMI* Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	50	2	50	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Grade 8
WISC-IV/SB-V WMI*

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	1	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	1	100
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

Kindergarten
WISC-IV PSI

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

Grade 1
WISC-IV PSI

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	8	72.7	3	27.3
120-124	5	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0

Grade 2
WISC-IV PSI

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	18	58.1	13	41.9
120-124	3	75	1	25
125-129	3	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	50	2	50

Grade 3
WISC-IV PSI

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	18	56.3	14	43.8
120-124	2	100	0	0
125-129	1	50	1	50
≥ 130	2	100	0	0

Grade 4
WISC-IV PSI

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	13	56.5	10	43.5
120-124	6	85.7	1	14.3
125-129	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	3	100	0	0

Grade 5
WISC-IV PSI

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	7	58.3	5	41.7
120-124	5	100	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	

	Grade 6 WISC-IV PSI				Grade 7 WISC-IV PSI			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	3	60	2	40	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Grade 8 WISC-IV PSI			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	1	100
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

---

*This table includes 12 cases using the SB5 score equivalents as described previously.

Table 86 shows gifted program decision by grade of referred child by achievement test score levels

Table 86

Gifted program decision by grade of referred child by achievement test score levels.

	Kindergarten WIAT-II WR				Grade 1 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	0	0	3	75	1	25
120-124	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
125-129	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
≥ 130	0	0	1	100	9	100	0	0

	Grade 2 WIAT-II WR				Grade 3 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	8	44.4	10	55.6	15	53.6	13	46.4
120-124	5	62.5	3	37.5	4	66.7	2	33.3
125-129	9	81.8	2	18.2	4	100	0	0
≥ 130	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0

	Grade 4 WIAT-II WR				Grade 5 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	15	55.6	12	44.4	11	68.8	5	31.3
120-124	5	83.3	1	16.7	1	100	0	0
125-129	3	100	0	0	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Grade 6 WIAT-II WR				Grade 7 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Grade 8 WIAT-II WR			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	50	1	50
≥ 130	0	0	0	0

	Kindergarten WIAT-II NO				Grade 1 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	0	0	1	100	9	75	3	25
120-124	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
125-129	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0

	Grade 2 WIAT-II NO				Grade 3 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	15	51.7	14	48.3	11	47.8	12	52.2
120-124	4	80	1	20	5	83.3	1	16.7
125-129	2	100	0	0	3	60	2	40
≥ 130	6	85.7	1	14.3	4	100	0	0

	Grade 4 WIAT-II NO				Grade 5 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	5	50	5	50	2	40	3	60
120-124	4	80	1	20	2	100	0	0
125-129	8	72.7	3	27.3	2	100	0	0
≥ 130	8	66.7	4	33.3	8	80	2	20

	Grade 6 WIAT-II NO				Grade 7 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
≤ 119	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

	Grade 8 WIAT-II NO			
	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Score Range				
≤ 119	0	0	0	0
120-124	0	0	0	0
125-129	1	100	0	0
≥ 130	0	0	1	100

Table 87 shows gifted program decision by grade of referred child by teacher and by parent input ratings.

Table 87

Gifted program decision by grade of referred child by teacher and by parent input ratings

	Kindergarten Teacher Input Rating				Kindergarten Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100

	Grade 1 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 1 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	2	66.7	1	33.3	2	100	0	0
Recommendation	6	85.7	1	14.3	3	75.0	1	25
Strong Recommendation	7	87.5	1	12.5	9	81.8	2	18.2

	Grade 2 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 2 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	3	42.9	4	57.1	0	0	1	100
Recommendation	7	43.8	9	56.3	8	80	2	20
Strong Recommendation	16	88.9	2	11.1	18	64.3	10	35.7

	Grade 3 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 3 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	4	57.1	3	42.9	1	33.3	2	66.7
Recommendation	5	33.3	10	66.7	3	33.3	6	66.7
Strong Recommendation	15	93.8	1	6.3	15	71.4	6	28.6

	Grade 4 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 4 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	2	100	1	100	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	25	3	75	2	66.7	1	33.3
Recommendation	9	52.9	8	47.1	7	43.8	9	56.3
Strong Recommendation	16	100	0	0	15	93.8	1	6.3

	Grade 5 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 5 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Recommendation	4	57.1	3	42.9	5	83.3	1	16.7
Strong Recommendation	9	81.8	2	18.2	7	77.8	2	22.2

	Grade 6 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 6 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
Recommendation	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	50	1	50
Strong Recommendation	0	0	1	100	1	100	0	0

	Grade 7 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 7 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Strong Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

	Grade 8 Teacher Input Rating				Grade 8 Parent Input Rating			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Score Range								
No Recommendation	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Marginal Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recommendation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Strong Recommendation	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0

Chapter 5

Discussion

Question 1: What are the demographic characteristics of students referred for assessment to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these demographic characteristics vary greatly by referral source or school building or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

The data set was examined to determine the demographic characteristics of students referred for assessment to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program. Tables 1 through 19 in Chapter 4 reflect the data relevant to this research question. Of 168 referrals for asssessment examined, 75 were categorized as a school referral, representing 44.6% of the total, and 93 were categorized as a parent referral, representing 55.4% of the total. During the time period examined by this study, the school district had a total of ten school buildings contributing to the gifted referrals. Additional analysis of the data revealed that eleven school psychologists were involved in the completion of the 168 evaluations. Of these eleven school psychologists, some were full-time, salaried district employees; some were contracted on a part-time basis to complete the evaluations for the district, and two were school psychologist interns. Approximately two-thirds of the total referrals were completed by two of the full-time, salaried district school psychologists.

Two elementary school buildings with the larger student enrollments had the highest percentage rates of gifted referrals, with 21.4% and 20.8% of the total referrals. The other six elementary school buildings had percentage rates ranging from 1.2% through 14.3% of the total number of referrals. It should be noted that although much

larger in size, the two junior high schools had significantly fewer referrals originating from each building, with .6% and 1.2% of the total number of referrals.

Generally speaking, parents as a whole made slightly more referrals than did teachers, yet both teachers and parents referred a slightly greater number of boys than girls. Additional analysis of the frequency of parent versus teacher referrals in each building in the school district showed that most of the larger elementary schools referred the greater number of children, and the two junior high schools referred significantly fewer children, regardless of the source of the referral. Only in two of three smaller, less populated elementary school buildings did there appear to be a bias toward parent referral; almost twice to three times as many parents referred children from these schools, as compared with the teacher referrals.

Overall, seventy-one teachers were named within the final GWR as being part of the referral and/or evaluation process. These seventy-one teachers either referred the child, provided input for the evaluation, or did both. No one teacher stood out from the others as referring significantly more children. The number of students with which any one individual teacher was involved ranged between one and four.

In this study, the data revealed that boys outnumbered girls by way of a small margin; specifically, 53.6% compared with 46.4%. As anticipated, a variety of ethnic groups were represented in the study, and the general population proportions of the district were reflected, with 82.1% of the students classified as being of Caucasian descent. Of the remaining students, 7.1% were classified as Hispanic, 5.4% were classified as Asian, 3.6% were classified as African American, and 1.8% were classified as "Other." The data showed fairly equal proportions of teacher versus parent referrals in

all categories with the exception of a potential parent bias in referring Asian children, as well as children classified in the "Other" category. In these two instances, parents referred children approximately two to three times more often than did teachers.

Additionally, 7.7% of the children had either an exceptionality previously identified or had a possible exceptionality investigated and was either confirmed or disproved by way of the gifted evaluation. Previously identified disabilities included Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Speech and Language Impairment (SLI), Other Health Impairment (OHI), Central Auditory Processing Disorder (CAPD), Specific Learning Disability (SLD), and ADHD with concomitant color-blindness. Possible disabilities either confirmed or disproved by way of the gifted evaluation included SLD/SLI, and Asperger's Disorder with SLD/SLI. The data revealed that teachers and parents referred almost identical proportions of children without exceptionalities; however, parents were twice as likely as teachers to refer children who had either a confirmed and/or suspected exceptionality.

The age of the students included in the data set ranged from 5 through 14, with a mode of 9 years old and a mean and median both approximately 9.5 years old. The grade level of the participants ranged from kindergarten through eighth grade, with 72% of the participants assigned to either grade two, three, or four. Age typically correlates with grade level and to this end, the data clearly showed that a student was more likely to be referred by both teachers and parents while in the intermediate primary grades (2, 3, and 4), as compared with early primary grades (K and 1) and/or early secondary grades (5, 6, 7, and 8). As for these grades that had fewer referrals in general, it is interesting to note that only parents referred children in kindergarten and eighth grade, and twice as many

parents as teachers referred first grade children. All of the referrals for children in sixth and seventh grades were made by teachers alone. This finding reflects a district-wide pattern of fewer teacher-initiated gifted referrals in the early primary grades.

Question 2: What assessment procedures were used to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these procedures vary by school psychologists performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

The data in Table 20 show that the WISC-IV was used as the intellectual assessment component for the vast majority of referrals. The SB5 was used in very few cases as an alternative to the WISC-IV, and the WPPSI-III was administered to one child instead of the WISC-IV, based on age. Five children were administered both the WISC-IV and the SB5. Variations in the selection and/or use of intelligence tests appeared to be primarily attributable to the age of the child. In the relatively few cases in which both the WISC-IV and SB5 were administered, the variation appeared to be attributable to the professional discretion and/or personal preference of the school psychologist performing the evaluation, although presumably to aid in 'close call' eligibility decisions.

The WIAT-II was used exclusively as the achievement assessment component, but not all students were administered the same subtests from the WIAT-II. Virtually every evaluation included the WIAT-II Word Reading subtest, the WIAT-II Numerical Operations subtest, and the WIAT-II Spelling subtest, regardless of school psychologist performing the evaluation, the school building, the referral source, gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, and age and/or grade of the referred children. Further

analysis revealed that there were relatively few cases in which the WIAT-II Math Reasoning, WIAT-II Reading Comprehension, and WIAT-II Written Expression subtests were included. In all of these cases, these additional subtests were administered because the child had either a confirmed or a suspected exceptionality other than mental giftedness and hence, additional areas of academic achievement were explored by the school psychologist performing the assessment.

Teacher and parent input was sought in every case, regardless of the school psychologist performing the evaluation, the school building, referral source, gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade. It was noted, however, that there were some cases for which either the teacher or the parent input was not returned and therefore, every evaluation did not always include one or both of these components in the final GWR.

Additional, supplemental assessment components including gifted rating scales (the GES-2 and/or Williams Scale) were used in fewer than half of the cases by six of the eleven school psychologists at the professional discretion/and or personal preference of the school psychologist performing the evaluation. These six school psychologists also varied in regard to consistency of use, with some administering gifted rating scales in virtually every case he or she conducted, yet others used them only on an infrequent basis. In a few cases, the school psychologist used both of these gifted rating scales within the same evaluation.

Finally, it should be noted that in one case, an additional, supplemental assessment component included a student's Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) scores. In this case, it appears that an original outcome decision of 'not gifted'

was challenged by the parent. In the end, the review, analysis, and inclusion of this student's PSSA scores appears to have altered the eligibility outcome. Again, this variation in practice did not appear to be attributable to school building, referral source, gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of the referred child but rather to the professional discretion of the school psychologist performing this particular evaluation.

Question 3: How did children perform on the assessments? Did performance vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

The WISC-IV potentially yields 6 scores: the VCI, PRI, WMI, PSI, FSIQ, and GAI. Not all of the school psychologists calculated the GAI for use in decision-making. In cases in which the GAI was not calculated by the school psychologist that administered the WISC-IV, the GAI was calculated afterward and was included in the data set for these analyses. The SB5 provides comprehensive coverage of five factors of cognitive ability: Fluid Reasoning, Knowledge, Quantitative Reasoning, Visual-Spatial Processing, and Working Memory. Additionally, the SB5 yields two domain scales: the Nonverbal IQ (NVIQ), which combines the five nonverbal subtests, and the Verbal IQ (VIQ), which combines the five verbal subtests. Finally, the SB5 Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) combines all ten subtests.

For purposes of data comparison, the SB5 VIQ was used as an equivalent to the WISC-IV VCI; the SB5 NVIQ was used as an equivalent to the WISC-IV PRI; the SB5

WM was used as an equivalent to the WISC-IV WMI, and the SB5 FSIQ was used as an equivalent to the WISC-IV FSIQ. Additionally, all scores from tests using a mean of 100, standard deviation of 15 metric (WISC-IV, SB5, and WIAT-II are reported in score ranges as follows: less than or equal to 119, 120-124, 125-129, and greater than or equal to 130).

Finally, teacher and parent input was analyzed and then rated with a numeric qualifier, equating to the following classifications: "No Recommendation," "Marginal Recommendation," "Recommendation," and "Strong Recommendation." Tables 21 through 36 in Chapter 4 show the frequency counts of scores within each score range.

Performance on Intellectual Ability and Academic Achievement Measures

There were approximately 98 children who had a FSIQ and/or GAI at or above 130; 68 children who had a FSIQ and/or GAI in the range of 125-129; 63 children who had a FSIQ and/or GAI in the range of 120-124, and 99 children who had a FSIQ and/or GAI at or below 119.

In regard to earned VCI scores, 68 children earned a VCI at or below 119; 28 children earned a VCI in the range of 120-124; 26 children earned a VCI in the range of 125-129, and 45 children earned a VCI at or above 130. PRI standard scores earned by the participants were almost identical in all score ranges. 73 children earned PRI standard scores at or below 119; 28 children earned PRI standard scores in the range of 120-124; 29 children earned PRI standard scores in the range of 125-129, and 38 children earned PRI standard scores at or above 130. Comparatively, a slightly greater number of children earned VCI scores in this same range, at or above 130.

It is interesting to note the breakdown for WMI and PSI standard scores. These skill domains had significantly fewer children earning standard scores at 125 and above, as compared with the VCI and PRI composites. One hundred and thirty-five children earned a WMI of 124 or lower and only 32 children earned WMI standard scores of 125 and higher. The same trend was true for the PSI, with 140 children earning a PSI standard score of 124 or lower and only 20 children had a PSI of 125 or higher. This finding is relevant in regard to the PDE's revised guidelines (2010), which underscore the following rule: "Deficits in memory or processing speed, as indicated by testing, cannot be the sole basis upon which a student is determined to be ineligible for gifted special education." In this sample population, WMI and PSI standard scores, indeed, were notably lower than VCI and PRI scores earned by the participants.

The data by standard score range for achievement subtest standard scores showed that most children earned standard scores of 124 or lower versus 125 or higher. For example, 105 children earned standard scores of 124 or lower and only 60 children earned standard scores of 125 or higher on the WIAT-II Numerical Operations subtest. Similarly, 121 children earned standard scores of 124 or lower and only 44 children earned standard scores of 125 or higher on the WIAT-II Word Reading subtest. On the WIAT-II Spelling subtest, 114 children earned standard scores of 124 or lower, but only 50 earned standard scores of 125 or higher.

When comparing performance variations on assessments by school psychologists performing the evaluation, there were some differences noted between the two school psychologists who had conducted the majority of the referrals. For example, the assessments conducted by school psychologist #1 resulted in 34.6% of students earning a

VCI at or below 119 and 28.8% of students earning a VCI at or above 130, representing a fairly even split between the two standard score ranges. The assessments conducted by school psychologist #8, however, resulted in 60.0% of students earning a VCI at or below 119 and only 13.3% of students earning a VCI at or above 130. These differences may have been random, but it is also certainly possible that they are attributable to subjective differences in interpreting the students' answers on verbal items, i.e., more stringent or less stringent interpretation of the scoring criteria for 0-point, 1-point, or 2-point responses by the school psychologist performing the evaluation.

To that end, differences in PRI standard scores comparing these same two school psychologists did not reflect discrepancies, but instead, almost identical percentage rates. The assessments conducted by school psychologist #1 resulted in 40.4% of students earning a PRI at or below 119, and 23.1% earning a PRI at or above 130. The assessments conducted by school psychologist #8 resulted in 45.0% earning a PRI at or below 119, and 23.3% earning a PRI at or above 130. It is significant to note that the scoring criteria for the PRI subtests are objective and highly specific. Perhaps this distinction helps to explain the virtually identical breakdown of percentage rates for the PRI between these two examiners despite the disproportionate percentage rates for the VCI between these two examiners. Breakdown in percentage rates for the WMI, PSI, GAI, and FSIQ, as compared between these two examiners were similar as well. Likewise, performance on all of the academic achievement subtests did not vary by school psychologist conducting the evaluation.

Variations in performance on the ability and achievement assessments did not exist by school building, but rather equally proportionate percentages were evident across

all buildings. Additionally, the data showed that proportions within performance levels on the intellectual ability assessments were essentially the same whether or not the referral had originated from the parent or from the teacher. The same was true for performance on the academic achievement subtests because most children, whether they were referred by teachers or by parents, earned standard scores at or below 119 on the selected academic achievement subtests.

When examining performance across gender, boys and girls tended to perform in a similar manner on both the ability and the achievement measures. When examining performance across ethnicity, there were no differences noted in regard to academic achievement; however, there were some minor variations in regard to performance on the ability measures. For example, children of Asian descent earned slightly lower standard scores in perceptual reasoning tasks, as compared with Caucasians. Conversely, children of Asian descent proportionately earned slightly higher standard scores on working memory and processing speed tasks, as compared with children of Caucasian descent. Hence, there was a higher percentage rate of Caucasian children who had GAI scores at or above 130, because in those cases, the exclusion of the WMI and PSI positively impacted the calculation of their GAI.

When examining performance relative to whether or not an additional exceptionality existed, it is interesting to note, that proportionately speaking, children who had an additional exceptionality displayed relative strength in their verbal reasoning skills. 25.2% of children who had no exceptionality earned a VCI at or above 130, but 46.2% of children who had an additional exceptionality earned a VCI in this same range.

Generally speaking, however, differences in other ability and achievement skill areas were not noted between these two groups.

When examining performance relative to age, it is noteworthy that six-year-olds had the highest percentage rate of Full Scale and GAI standard scores at 130 or above, with 72.7% of the age group falling into this range for both domains. As an age group, six-year-olds also had the highest percentage rates of children earning standard scores at or above 130 on the WIAT-II Word Reading and Spelling subtests. These variations in performance may reflect limitations in ceiling levels on these tests for younger aged children, or may be skewed altogether due to the smaller number of children in this age group. Of course, it is also possible that perhaps the differences are truly indicative of relative strengths possessed by six-year-olds in the study.

When examining performance on ability measures, relative to grade levels, a significantly higher percentage of kindergarten children and first graders, 50.0% and 55.6%, respectively, earned PRI standard scores at or above 130. This finding was not true for the VCI in these same two grades. Fifth graders, as a group, had the highest percentage rate of children earning a VCI of 130 or higher. On the other hand, regardless of grade level, most children earned WMI and PSI standard scores at or below 119. As for FSIQ and GAI, first graders had the highest percentage rates at or above 130, with 61.1% earning that type of standard score in both composite areas. Again, it is unclear whether or not this high percentage rate reflects some sort of test score inflation for children that young or another, unknown factor.

When examining performances on academic achievement measures related to grade levels, most children, regardless of their grade levels, earned standard scores at or

below 119. Standard scores at or above 130 on achievement subtests were outliers at all grade levels.

Teacher and Parent Input Scores

When comparing differences between the levels of recommendation relative to referral source, the overwhelming majority of the input was classified as a "strong recommendation," regardless of whether or not a parent or a teacher initiated the referral. There were relatively few "non-recommendations," with only 3.0% noted in the Teacher Input category and .6% in the Parent Input category.

This same type of trend is noted in all other comparisons, whether it be by school psychologist conducting the evaluation, by school building, gender, ethnic background, age and/or grade, because most recommendations given, whether by teacher or parent, were qualified in the top two categories ("strong recommendation" and/or "recommendation"). However, there was one striking finding in the comparison of teacher and parent input scores by other exceptionality. Teachers were much more likely to give a "strong recommendation" for children who had no exceptionality versus those children who had another exceptionality (45.4 % vs. 15.4%). Parents, on the other hand, did not appear to make such a distinction, with a more even split in giving children a "strong recommendation" regardless of whether or not that child had a disability or not (60.6% vs. 50.0%).

Question 4: What criteria were used to determine eligibility for services through the gifted program? Did these criteria vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

The Gifted Guidelines for identification of mentally gifted students as set forth by the PDE were relied upon when determining eligibility for services through the gifted program (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2005). It should be noted that shortly after the data collection and analysis took place for this study, PDE updated their guidelines for identification of mentally gifted students, specifically in August 2010. Because these changes were made after data collection and analysis, they did not have an impact on any part of this study. For further information and discussion regarding the PDE's guidelines for gifted identification practices, see Chapter 2.

Without a matrix and/or flow chart to guide eligibility decisions for the gifted program, the eleven school psychologists that performed evaluations during this study's time frame had much wider latitude in making eligibility decisions. Indeed, analysis of the data revealed that in more than a handful of cases, decision outcomes varied, depending upon the school psychologist performing the evaluation. Although the criteria used for eligibility decisions did not vary by school building, referral source, gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age, and/or grade of the referred child, decisions made by individual school psychologists involved some degree of professional judgment. With that said, it is unknown to what extent that judgment varied from person to person. Issues related to eligibility decisions are further discussed in the section on Question 6 later in this chapter.

Question 5: What are the relationships among the various assessment components?

Tables 37 through 45 show the correlations among scores on assessment measures, as well as the relationships among the various test composites by standard score categorization or level. Not surprisingly, the strongest correlation among scores on assessment measures was between the FSIQ and the GAI. The second strongest correlation was between the PRI and the GAI, and the third strongest correlation was between the VCI and the GAI. Moderate correlations were noted between the FSIQ and the VCI, and the FSIQ and the PRI. The PSI had the lowest correlations with all other factors. The WMI and the PSI correlated less well with the FSIQ as compared with the VCI and the PRI, lending credence for the need to calculate the GAI in many, if not all, cases.

Among comparisons between the WIAT-II achievement subtest standard scores, the highest correlation was noted between the WIAT-II Spelling and Written Expression subtests. Other than this relationship, correlations were unimpressive. Correlations between the WISC-IV/SB5 ability composites and teacher and parent input were not noteworthy; however, it is interesting to note that the teacher input and the WIAT-II Math Reasoning scores positively correlated.

When comparing the relationship between Verbal IQ and Nonverbal IQ standard scores by level, it is worthwhile to note that fifteen students earned standard scores at or above 130 in both domains, and thirty-eight earned standard scores equal to or less than 119 in both domains.

When comparing the relationship between Verbal IQ and Working Memory scores, only 2 students earned standard scores at or above 130 in both skill areas, reflecting the weaker correlation between the two domains. A large number of students, forty-eight of them, earned standard scores equal to or less than 119 in both composite areas.

When comparing the relationship between Verbal IQ and Processing Speed scores by level, the weaker correlation between these two domains is similarly noted, with thirty-two students earning Verbal IQ scores at or above 130, and simultaneously earning PSI standard scores that were equal to or less than 119. Only five students achieved scores at or above 130 in both domains; forty-six of them earned standard scores equal to or less than 119 in both areas.

When comparing the relationship between Nonverbal IQ and Working Memory, fifty-four students earned standard scores equal to or less than 119 in both areas. Fourteen students earned a PRI score of 130 or above, yet earned a WMI standard score of less than or equal to 119. Only three students earned both PRI and WMI standard scores of 130 or above. Again, the weaker correlation between these two domains is evident.

Similarly, when comparing the relationship between Nonverbal IQ and Processing Speed, fifty-three students earned scores equal to less than 119 in both skill areas. Twenty-two students earned a PRI of 130 or above, yet earned a PSI standard score of less than or equal to 119. Only three students earned both PRI and PSI standard scores at or above 130.

When comparing the relationship between FSIQ and GAI, thirty-nine students earned scores at or below 119 on both composites, and a nearly identical number, thirty-

three, earned scores of 130 or above on both composites. Sixteen additional students earned a GAI of 130 or above, yet their FSIQ was slightly lower and within the range of 125-129. Five students earned a FSIQ of 130 or above, yet their GAI was slightly lower and within the range of 125-129. Another fifteen students earned both a FSIQ and a GAI within the range of 125-129. Clearly, these findings have implications for ability score thresholds as they relate to inclusion and exclusion for eligibility. In this study, these categorical distinctions involve more than a handful of students.

When comparing the relationship between FSIQ and WIAT-II Word Reading standard scores, only eleven students earned standard scores of 130 or above for both areas. A large number of students, forty-four, earned a FSIQ and WIAT-II Word Reading score at or below 119. The findings were similar when comparing the relationship between the FSIQ and the WIAT-II Numerical Operations subtest standard scores. Only fourteen students earned standard scores of 130 or above in both areas. Conversely, forty-one students earned standard scores of 119 or less for both, indicating that for many students, when FSIQ was lower, so also were their math calculation abilities.

Question 6: What assessment components and/or demographic variables had the greatest influence on eligibility decisions? Did these components vary by school psychologist performing the evaluation, by school building, or referral source, or by gender, ethnic background, other exceptionality, age and/or grade of referred children?

Tables 46 through 87 address the sixth research question of this study. Gifted program decisions appeared to vary to some extent by the school psychologist performing the evaluation. For example, when comparing the two school psychologists who

conducted two-thirds of the total evaluations examined within this study, one had a split of 67.3% students qualifying and 32.7% not qualifying, but the second school psychologist had a fifty-fifty split. The school psychologist who had conducted the third highest number of evaluations qualified 87.5%, and rendered the other 12.5% students ineligible. Although assessment components for each evaluation varied to some extent among the eleven school psychologists, and at times even within the cases of individual school psychologists, variations in eligibility decisions did not appear to be attributable to such differences, but rather to variations in professional judgment and/or the weight placed on factors within an evaluation that involved information that was not gathered as part of the data set for this study.

Some variations in gifted program decisions existed by school building. This finding is logical because for a portion of the four school years examined within this study, the district sent their school psychologists to multiple buildings rather than having specific, designated school building assignments for each school psychologist. Otherwise stated, although some school psychologists may have conducted the majority of evaluations in certain buildings, no one school psychologist completed all the evaluations in any one building. Hence, there were multiple school psychologists conducting evaluations in various buildings, and because there was some variation by way of school psychologist performing the evaluation, one would expect to see this fact reflected, at least to some extent, by the data collected on the building level as well.

In the majority of school buildings, there were a greater number of children who did qualify than those children who did not qualify, usually with a breakdown ranging anywhere from fifty-fifty to two-thirds qualifying versus one-third to one-half not

qualifying. There were a few exceptions noted to this pattern. For example, in both school buildings that were junior high schools at the time, there was one referral from each school and neither student qualified. This finding may have more to do with other variables; for example, perhaps those individuals who generate referrals for older children are not as accurate in their judgment of mental giftedness; however, the sample is too small to form any sound hypotheses about this anomaly.

In regard to referral source, gifted program decisions were proportionately the same. Of the 75 teacher referrals, fifty-two students, or 69.3%, were found to be eligible for the gifted program, but twenty-three students or 30.7% did not qualify. As for the parent referrals, fifty-nine students, or 63.4%, qualified for the gifted program, but thirty-four students, or 36.6% did not qualify.

As for gender, it is interesting to note that more boys than girls overall (seventy-eight girls versus ninety boys) were referred for a gifted evaluation; however, the percentage rate of those qualifying, regardless of gender, was essentially the same. 67.9% of the girls qualified for the gifted program, and a nearly identical rate of 64.4% of boys qualified as well.

In regard to ethnic background, all categories, with the exception of Asian children, had approximately two-thirds of children qualifying versus one-third not qualifying. However, as noted, this was not the case for children of Asian descent. The distinction between qualifying and not qualifying was closer to a fifty-fifty split, although still in favor of qualifying, with 55.6% found eligible for the gifted program and 44.4% found not eligible. Assessment components within an evaluation did not vary simply because a child was of Asian descent or of any other background for that matter. This

finding more likely was related to the school psychologist performing the evaluation or to some inherent differences in judgment and/or emphasis resulting from other, unknown factors not reflected in the data set collected for this study.

Gifted program decisions did seem to vary by other exceptionality. The familiar percentage rate breakdown of approximately two-thirds qualifying versus one-third not qualifying was seen in children who did not have any other known or suspected exceptionalities; 63.2% of these children qualified for the gifted program, and 36.8% did not. However, all 13 children who had suspected or confirmed exceptionalities or disabilities were found to be eligible for the gifted program. Upon closer inspection of the data collected, these children had wide variations in scores earned on the various assessment measures; nonetheless, all of them qualified for the gifted program. Again, it appears that the school psychologists performing the evaluations may have placed greater emphasis on the fact that these thirteen children's disability and/or disabilities equated to an 'intervening factor masking giftedness'; therefore, all of the children were given the benefit of the doubt and were found eligible for the gifted program.

When looking at gifted program decision by age, the data clearly shows that the youngest children in the study boasted the highest 'hit rate' for qualifying for the program, with percentage rates ranging from 90.9 % of all six-year-olds qualifying to a 100% qualifying rate for the lone five-year-old in the study. For seven-year-olds, a familiar breakdown was seen, with two-thirds of the total qualifying and one-third of the total not qualifying (67.6% versus 32.4%). For eight-year-olds, it was closer to a fifty-fifty rate, and nine-year-olds had 71.1% qualifying versus 28.9% that did not. Ten-year-olds had a 60% qualifying rate and eleven-year-olds had an 80% qualifying rate. As age

further increased, however, the percentage rate for qualifying grew smaller, with only 33.3% of twelve-year-olds and 50% of fourteen-year-olds qualifying. This trend may suggest that as children grow older, it may be more difficult to identify characteristics and behaviors clearly associated with intellectual giftedness and that on the other hand, referral of very young children is perhaps simple and obvious; however, there were very few participants in the youngest and oldest age groups; hence, such a generalization may not apply to a larger sample size.

As for gifted program decision by grade level, again the greatest variation in qualifying rates occurred at the extreme ends of the grade range. As expected, this finding was consistent with findings related to age, because age correlates highly with grade. Out of two kindergarten students, one student was found eligible for the program, but the other one was not. In grades one through six, the majority of children met eligibility criteria, with a percentage rate ranging anywhere from 60.0% to 83.3%. However, in grades seven and eight, the outcome was drastically different. The sole seventh grader in the study did not qualify, but the qualification rate in eighth grade was fifty-fifty. Again, one must be careful not to generalize meaning from this finding with so few students representing these particular grade levels in the current study.

Implications for the Field of School Psychology and the School District

The eleven school psychologists within this study exercised professional judgment, resulting in greater variability and lack of consistency with regard to decision outcomes. It is likely that the lack of consistency was due in part to the lack of a district-wide policy operationalized in the form of a decision matrix and/or flow chart that could

be used to guide decision-making. Despite the aforementioned variability among school psychologists, the data clearly shows that the FSIQ of the student was the factor most closely associated with eligibility decisions. All of the eighty-three students who had earned a FSIQ of 125 or higher qualified for the gifted program. On the other hand, an overwhelming majority of children who had a FSIQ of 119 or lower (forty-seven of fifty-three) did not qualify for the program. Hence, the data appear to suggest that having a FSIQ of 125 or higher facilitated the decision-making process and resulted in positive identification as mentally gifted, but a FSIQ at or below 119 also facilitated the decision-making process and resulted in a non-exceptional outcome.

However, there were sixty-three referrals wherein the student's FSIQ and/or GAI was within the range of 120-124; forty-two of these students were identified as mentally gifted but twenty-one were not. Upon further analysis of the data specific to these sixty-three cases, it is unclear why some children qualified and some did not, when the students had virtually identical scores. Some degree of professional judgment was allowed to be exercised by each school psychologist, and it is unknown to what extent that judgment varied from school psychologist to school psychologist or what other factors may have had an impact on the decision. Although these unknown factors may have been sufficiently compelling, at least in certain cases, to result in inconsistent decision outcomes in the presence of identical test scores, the existence of these specific cases confirmed the need to make the identification process more specific and systematic, with ameliorating circumstances clearly articulated.

Ideally, the entire evaluation process needs to include a standardized set of assessment procedures, regardless of the school psychologist completing the evaluation.

The creation of a matrix and/or flow chart to guide eligibility decision-making needs to weigh factors fairly including but not limited to, FSIQ and/or GAI, especially for cases for which the global score of ability is 124 or lower. Additionally, other factors such as other composite scores from the intellectual assessment, scores from achievement tests, rating scale data, and input from parents and teachers need to be included and weighted fairly. Finally, the consideration of students who may have a disability and whose giftedness may be masked to some extent by their disability, needs to continue as a practice with clear guidelines for ensuring this practice is written into district policy guidelines.

Limitations of the Study

Because the data was not available for the number of children receiving reduced lunch, the impact of economic disadvantage within this study is unknown. In addition, the study examined only data collected on 168 participants. An analysis examining a longer period of time (for example, six to eight years versus four years) would improve the generalizability of the findings because there would be a greater number of participants included in the data set.

Data collection for the current study included only scores from intellectual ability and academic achievement tests, gifted rating scales, and teacher and parent input ratings. Information was not gathered from files about additional factors that may have influenced eligibility decisions.

Another limitation of this study relates to the lack of diversity within the student population. Although the student population in this particular school district has become

less homogeneous in recent years, the majority remains composed of Caucasian students from middle-income families.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future research could include data for variables pertaining to economic disadvantage so that this factor could be examined thoroughly. An additional suggestion would be to compare and contrast two four-year periods. For example, should the district decide to implement a matrix and/or flow chart following this study's conclusion in an attempt to guide decision-making in a more systematic way, it would be interesting to conduct a future study analyzing the same variables and factors. To this end, the 'old way' for the referral, assessment and identification of mentally gifted students could be compared with the 'new way' of doing things.

References

Ackerman, C. M. (1997). Identifying gifted adolescents using personality characteristics: Dabrowski's overexcitabilities. *Roeper Review, 19,* 229-237.

Adderholdt, M., & Goldberg, J. (1999). Perfectionism: What's bad about being too good? Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.

Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing (7th ed.).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ashman, S. S., & Vukelich, C. (1983). The effect of different types of nomination forms on teachers identification of gifted children. *Psychology in the schools, 20,* 518-527.

Bain, S. K., Choate, S. M., & Bliss, S. L. (2006). Perceptions of developmental, social, and emotional issues in giftedness: Are they realistic? *Roeper Review, 29(1),* 41-48.

Baker, J. (1996). Everyday stressors of academically gifted adolescents. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 7*, 356-368.

Baum, S. (1990). *Gifted but learning disabled: A puzzling paradox.* Retrieved on September 14, 2006, from http://www.hoagiesgifted.org/eric/e479.html

Bouchet, N., & Falk, R. F. (2001). The relationship among giftedness, gender, and overexcitability. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 45,* 260-267.

Bracken, B. A. (2008). Nontraditional strategies for identifying nontraditional gifted and talented students. In VanTassel-Baska, J. L. (Ed.), *Alternative assessments with gifted and talented students.* (pp. 17-40). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Bracken, B. A., & Brown, E. F. (2006). Behavioral identification and assessment of gifted and talented students. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 24(2),* 112-122.

Bracken, B. A., & Keith, L. K. (2004). Professional manual for the Clinical Assessment of Behavior. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Bracken, B. A., & McCallum, R. S. (1998). Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test. Itasca, IL: Riverside.

Brody, L.E., & Mills, C. J. (1997). Gifted children with learning disabilities: A review of the issues. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30,* 282-296.

Callahan, C. M., & Moon, T.R. (2007). Sorting the wheat from the chaff: What makes for good evidence of effectiveness in the literature in gifted education? *The Gifted Child Quarterly, 51(4),* 305-319.

Carroll, H. A. (1940). Genius in the making. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Coleman, M. R. (2003). *The identification of students who are gifted.* East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Digest ED480431).

Cordrey, L. J. (1986). *A report on former MGM-GATE students at Fullerton College*. Fullerton, CA: Fullerton College.

Cross, T. L., Speirs Neumeister, K. L., Cassady, J.C. (2007). Psychological types of academically gifted adolescents. *The Gifted Child Quarterly, 51(3),* 285-294.

Dabrowski, K. (1964). *Positive disintegration.* London: Little, Brown.

Dabrowski, K., & Piechowski, M. M. (1977). *Theory of levels of emotional developmental* (Vols. 1 & 2). Oceanside, NY: Dabor Science.

Davidson, J. E., & Sternberg, R. J. (1984). The role of insight in intellectual giftedness. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 28*, 58-64.

Davis, G. A., & Rimm, S. B. (1989). *Education of the gifted and talented* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Delbridge-Parker, L., & Robinson, D. (1989). Type and academically gifted adolescents. *Journal of Psychological Type, 17,* 66-72.

Derevensky, J., & Coleman, E. B. (1989). Gifted children's fears. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 33*, 65-68.

Feng, A. X., & VanTassel-Baska, J. L. (2008). Identifying low-income and minority students for gifted programs: Academic and affective impact of performance-based assessment. In VanTassel-Baska, J. L. (Ed.), *Alternative assessments with gifted and talented students.* (pp. 129-146). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Feuerstein, R. (1986). Learning to learn: Mediated learning experiences and instrumental enrichment. *Special services in the Schools, 3,* 49-82.

Freeman, J. (1994). Some emotional aspects of being gifted. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *17*, 197.

Friedman-Nimz, R., O'Brien, B., & Frey, B. B. (2005). Examining our foundations: implications for gifted education research. *Roeper Review, 28(1),* 45-52.

Gallagher, S. A. (1990). Personality patterns of the gifted. *Understanding Our Gifted, 3,* 11-13.

Gardner, H. (1997). Are there additional intelligences? In J. Kane (Ed.), *Education, information, and transformation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. (1962). *Creativity and intelligence: Explorations with gifted students*. New York: Wiley.

Gross, C. M., Rinn, A. N., & Jamieson, K. M. (2007). Gifted adolescents' overexcitabilities and self-concepts: An analysis of gender and grade level. *Roeper Review, 29(4),* 240-248.

Hawkins, J. (1997). Giftedness and psychological type. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 9,* 57-67.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: Conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 456-470.

Hollingworth, L. S. (1942). Children above 180 IQ: Stanford-Binet: Origin and development. New York: World Book Company.

Jarosewich, T., Pfeiffer, S. I., & Morris, J. (2002). Identifying gifted students using teacher rating scales: A review of existing instruments. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 20,* 322-336.

Jung, C. (1971). *The collected works of C. G. Jung: Vol. 6. Psychological types* (H. G. Baynes, Trans.; Revised by R. F. C. Hull). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published in 1921).

Kanevesky, L. (1992). The learning game. In P. S. Klein & A. J. Tannebaum (Eds.), *To be young and gifted* (pp. 204-243). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kirschenbaum, R. J. (1998). Dynamic assessment and its use with underserved gifted and talented populations. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 42,* 140-147.

Liu, Y. H., Lien, J., Kafka, T., & Stein, M. T. (2005). Discovering gifted children in pediatric practice. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 26(5),* 366-369.

Lovecky, D. (1991). The sensitive gifted boy. *Understanding Our Gifted, 3(4),* 3.

Lovett, B. J. & Lewandowski, L. J. (2006). Gifted students with learning disabilities: Who are they? *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39(6),* 515-527.

Marland, S. P. (1972). *Education of gifted and talented: Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

McCarney, S. B., & Anderson, P. D. (2000). *Gifted Evaluation Scale: Second Edition Technical Manual.* Columbia, MO: Hawthorne Educational Services, Inc.

McCarthy, S. V. (1975). Differential V-Q ability: Twenty years later. *Review of Educational Research, 45,* 263-282.

McCoach, D. B., Kehle, T., Bray, M. A., & Siegle, D. (2001). Best practices in the identification of gifted students with learning disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools, 38,* 403-411.

McGinn, P.V. (1976). Verbally gifted youth: Selection and description. In D. P. Keating (Ed.), *Intellectual talent: Research and development* (pp. 160-182). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mills, C. (2003). Characteristics of effective teachers of gifted students: Teacher backgrounds and personality styles of students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47,* 272-281.

Mills, C. J., Moore, N., & Parker, W. D. (1996). Psychological type and cognitive style in elementary age gifted students: Comparisons across age and gender. *Journal of Psychological Type, 38,* 13-23.

Mills, C. J., & Parker, W. D. (1998). Cognitive-psychological profiles of gifted adolescents from Ireland and the U.S.: Cross-societal comparisons. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22,* 1-16.

Minton, B. A., & Pratt, S. (2006) Identification discrepancies: Gifted and highly gifted students: How do they score on the SB5? *Roeper Review, 28(4),* 232-236.

Moon, T. R., Brighton, C. M., Callahan, C. M., & Jarvis, J. M. (2008). Twice-exceptional students: Being gifted and learning disabled—Implications of the IDEIA. In Grigorenko, E. L. (Ed.), *Educating individuals with disabilities: IDEIA 2004 and beyond.* (pp. 295-317). New York: Springer Publishing Co.

Morgan, H. (1996). An analysis of Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence. *Roeper Review, 18,* 263-269.

Myers, I. B. (1962). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator manual*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Naglieri, J. A. (1996). Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

Naglieri, J. A., & Ford, D. Y. (2003). Addressing underrepresentation of gifted minority children using the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT). *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47(2),* 155-161.

National Association for Gifted Children. (1998). *Position paper: Students with concomitant gifts and learning disabilities.* Retrieved September 14, 2006, from http://www.nagc.org/Policy/

Nichols, T., & Pass, A. (1993). Focus on individuality: Allow your students to bring their personalities into the classroom. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 5,* 26-28.

Nielsen, M. E. (2002). Gifted students with learning disabilities: Recommendations for identification and programming. *Exceptionality, 10,* 93-111,

Parker, W. D., & Adkins, K. K. (1995). The incidence of perfectionism in honors and regular college students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 7*, 303-309.

Parker, W. D., & Mills, C. J. (1996). The incidence of perfectionism in gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 40,* 194-199.

Parker, W. D., Portesova, S., Stumpf, H. (2001). Perfectionism in the mathematically gifted and typical Czech students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 25,* 138-152.

Passow, A. H., Frasier, M. M. (1996). Toward improving identification of talent potential among minority and disadvantaged students. *Roeper Review, 18,* 198-202.

Pennsylvania Department of Education (2005, November 23). *Gifted Education: A Parents' Guide.* Retrieved on September 14, 2006, from http://www.pde.state.pa.us/gifted_ed/cwp/view.asp?a=3&Q=73160&gifted_ed

Pfeiffer, S. I. (2002). Identifying gifted and talented students: Recurring issues and promising solutions. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19(1),* 31-50.

Pfeiffer, S. I. (2003). Challenges and opportunities for students who are gifted: What the experts say. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47(2),* 161-169.

Piechowski, M. M. (1979). Developmental potential. In N. Colangelo & R. R. Zaffrann (Eds.), *New voices in counseling the gifted* (pp. 2-58). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Piechowski, M. M. (1986). The concept of developmental potential. *Roeper Review, 8(3),* 190-197.

Piechowski, M. M., & Colangelo, N. (1984). Developmental potential of the gifted. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 28(2),* 80-88.

Plucker, J. A., & Levy, J. J. (2001). The downside of being talented. *American Psychologist, 56(1),* 75-76.

PsychCorp (2005). *Wechsler Individual Achievement Test Second Edition: Examiner's Manual Update 2005.* San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment, Inc.

Reis, S. M. & Renzulli, J. S. (2004). Current research on the social and emotional development of gifted and talented students: Good news and future possibilities. *Psychology in the schools, 41(1),* 119-130.

Renzulli, J. S. (1978). What makes giftedness? Reexamining a definition. *Phi Delta Kappan, 60,* 180-184, 261.

Renzulli, J. S. (2004). Identification of students for gifted and talented programs. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press and the National Association for Gifted Children.

Renzulli, J. S., Smith, L. H., White, A. J., Callahan, C. M., & Hartman, R. K. (1976). *Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students.* Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Roberts, S. M., & Lovett, S. B. (1994). Examining the "F" in gifted: Academically gifted adolescents' physiological and affective responses to scholastic failure. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 17,* 241-259.

Robinson, N. M. (2008). The value of traditional assessments as approaches to identifying academically gifted students. In VanTassel-Baska, J. L. (Ed.), *Alternative assessments with gifted and talented students.* (pp. 157-174). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press

Roeper, A. (1982). How the gifted cope with their emotions. *Roeper Review, 5*, 21-24.

Rogers, K. B. (1986). Do the gifted think and learn differently? A review of recent research and its implications for instruction. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 10,* 17-39.

Rohrer, J. C. (1995). Primary teacher conceptions of giftedness: Image, evidence, and nonevidence. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18,* 269-283.

Roid, G. H. (2003). *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition.* Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Shaunessy, E., Karnes, F. A., & Cobb, Y. (2004). Assessing potentially gifted students from lower socioeconomic status with nonverbal measures of intelligence. *Perceptual & Motor Skills, 98,* 1129-1138.

Silverman, L. K. (1993). *Counseling the gifted and talented.* Denver, CO: Love Publishing.

Silverman, L. K. (1994). The moral sensitivity of gifted children and the evolution of society. *Roeper Review, 17,* 110-116.

Silverman, L. K. (2003). Gifted children with learning disabilities. In N. A. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed., pp. 533-543). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sparrow, S. S., Pfeiffer, S. I., & Newman, T. M. (2005). Assessment of children who are gifted with the WISC-IV. In A. Prifitera, D. H. Saklofske, & L. G. Weiss, (Eds.), *WISC-IV: Clinical use and interpretation* (pp. 282-299). Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Speirs Neumeister, K. L. (2004). Factors influencing the development of perfectionism in gifted college students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 48,* 259-274.

Sternberg, R. J. (1981). A componential theory of intellectual giftedness. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 25,* 86-93.

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1991). Giftedness according to the triarchic theory of human intelligence. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education (2),* 45-54. Boston: Allyn& Bacon.

Terman, L. M. (1925). *Genetic studies of genius: Mental and physical traits of a thousand gifted children.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thurstone, L. L., (1938). *Primary Mental Abilities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tieso, C. L. (2007). Patterns of overexcitabilities in identified gifted students and their parents: A hierarchical model. *The Gifted Child Quarterly, 51(1),* 11-22.

Torrance, E. P., & Safter, H. T. (1999). Making the creative leap beyond. Buffalo, NY: Creative Education Foundation Press.

VanTassel-Baska, J. L., Feng, A. X., & Evans, B. L. (2007). Patterns of identification and performance among gifted students identified through performance tasks: A three-year analysis. *The Gifted Child Quarterly, 51(3),* 218-231.

Vieth, A. Z., & Trull, T. J. (1999). Family patterns of perfectionism: An examination of college students and their parents. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 72,* 49-67.

Von Karolyi, C. (2006). Issue awareness in young highly gifted children: Do the claims hold up? *Roeper Review, 28(3),* 167-174.

Watkins, M. W., Greenawalt, C. G., & Marcell, C. M. (2002). Factor structure of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Third Edition among gifted students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 62,* 164-172.

Wechsler, D. (1991). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children-third edition.* San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

Wechsler, D. (2003). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children-fourth edition.* San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment, Inc.

Wechsler, D. (2004). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children-fourth edition integrated: technical and interpretive manual.* San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment, Inc.

Whitmore, J. R. & Maker, C. J. (1985). *Intellectual giftedness in disabled persons.* Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.

Williams, F.E. (1993). The cognitive-affective interaction model for enriching gifted programs. In J.S. Renzulli (Ed.), *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented (pp. 461-484).* Highett, Vic.: Hawker Brownlow.

Winner, E. (1996). Gifted children: Myths and realities. New York: Basic Books.

Winner, E. (2000). The origins and ends of giftedness. *American Psychologist, 55,* 159-169.

Winstead, S. A. S. (1999). Worries of primary gifted girls (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 60, (2-A), 0343.